236.85 D252
Class Book
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

THE RESURRECTION OF THE FLESH

BY THE REV.

JOHN T. DARRAGH, D.D.

RECTOR EMERITUS OF S. MARY'S, JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA



LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1921

236.8S
D252

69984

PRINTED BY
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED
LONDON AND BECCLES

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

In Loving Memory

OF

M. D.

"A TRUE YOKEFELLOW"

WHO ENTERED INTO REST

MAY 3RD, 1899

. . . ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for OUR ADOPTION, to wit, THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY (Rom. viii. 23).

PREFACE

"NO article of the Christian faith has met with such vehement, persistent, and contentious opposition as the resurrection of the flesh."

So wrote S. Augustine many centuries ago.[1]

His experience was only an echo of S. Paul's, when he declared the same doctrine to the Athenians: *when they heard of the resurrection of the dead some mocked; "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods," because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection*[2] (Acts xvii. 18, 32). All through Christian history it has been the same.

So our own age is not singular in that respect, not even in that feature which is especially portentous, viz. that some Christians are ready to impugn the doctrine. S. Paul found some among his Corinthian converts who said: *there is no resurrection of the dead* (1 Cor. xv. 12). Others, later in the Apostle's life, declared: *the resurrection is past already* (2 Tim. ii. 18).

Called in question by some in every generation, the resurrection has engaged the best energies of Christian believers to maintain it fearlessly.

The original preachers of the Gospel put this truth in the very forefront from the first. The Acts of the Apostles show that the Resurrection of our Lord and the resurrection of His people formed almost exclusively the theme of the Apostles' preaching. The Epistles bear even earlier witness to this. It is no question of a stray text here and there. Nor is there any possible doubt or ambiguity about S. Paul's words, when in Romans, or in 1 and 2 Corinthians, he sets forth the resurrection, (1) as vital to the Faith of

[1] On Ps. lxxxviii. Ser. ii., n. 5, P. L. Tom. 36–7, p. 1134.
[2] Cf. the word-picture drawn in Wisdom ii. 1–3.

Christ, (2) not as something subsidiary or negligible. The Apostle's argument is that if men do not rise again, then it follows that Christ, the representative Man, did not rise. If He is not risen, all Christian teaching falls to the ground.

All recent literature in English dealing with resurrection concentrates on the Resurrection of our Lord, and only pays slight attention to the preliminary question, do men rise again at all? This treatise reverses the process, and puts the general question in the foreground. This is not done with a view to lessening the prime importance, evidentially and otherwise, of the event of Easter Day, but in the conviction that His Resurrection is best studied in connection with and not in isolation from the providential preparation of men's minds for that supreme revelation. It was God's answer to the hopes and aspirations of the human race from the beginning. History had been leading up to it. So it is placed here in line with men's anxious groping for a solution of the problem of the body's destiny. This problem is more than a mere curious peering into the future. It vitally concerns the present. If the body is to survive the shock of death and to be reunited in its integral essence with the soul, it lends a dignity to the body, both by way of inspiration and of restraint, which belief in the immortality of the soul by itself could never do.

Our Lord's Resurrection is regarded here as shedding light on men's tentative answers to the problem, and as illuminating all subsequent teaching on the subject. The greater part of our space is occupied with the Church's efforts, through her accepted writers, to express the truth of the general resurrection in the light of the one Resurrection that has so far occurred. Closely as the two are bound up together, it is possible to keep one or the other as the chief topic.

Since the late Dean Goulburn's Bampton Lectures in 1850, no book in English has been devoted principally to the subject of the resurrection of the body.[1] This is an attempt to supply the deficiency.

[1] W. Milligan's *Resurrection of the Dead* is primarily an exposition of 1 Cor. xv.

So fundamental an article of the Christian Faith cannot be left long in the background without serious loss. It is an old observation, that the articles of the Creed are so closely woven together, so interdependent, that neglect of any one is bound to react on the others. Disregard of the resurrection of the flesh, misunderstanding of its true meaning, forgetfulness of its profound practical importance, inevitably affect and weaken other portions of the Creed. The Second Coming of our Lord, the general Judgment of quick and dead, even the distinctive Christian belief, viz. in our Lord's Resurrection, are in jeopardy, when the resurrection of the body is called in question.

The doctrine of the general resurrection is not presented as a truth capable of mathematical proof.[1] It is an integral part of the Christian revelation, and stands or falls with it. What is aimed at is to show its intrinsic reasonableness, and to clear away misapprehensions from what is meant by the resurrection of the flesh. This can best be done by placing before the reader the exact terms used in exposition of the doctrine by Christian writers all down the Christian centuries. The testimonies come from various lands, from men of diverse natural gifts, different degrees of education and official position. Comparatively obscure writers are often better witnesses as to what was current Church teaching in their times than authors of more originality and independence. No writer who devotes space to the subject in East or West is overlooked. In some cases every reference to the Resurrection in their extant works is given. A few writers who like S. Augustine return again and again to the subject can only be given in selected passages, but a painstaking effort has been made to give thoroughly representative selections, and to omit nothing because it tells for or against the present writer's own conclusions.

We have here brought together for the first time a complete review of Christian methods of explaining the doctrine to contemporary Christians during eighteen hundred years. It is hoped that no one will be deterred by the

[1] See some helpful comments on this by W. Temple, *Mens Creatrix*, p. 296.

forest of references from studying the Appendices, which contain some important investigations never carried out on this scale before.[1]

The translations have aimed at absolute accuracy rather than at literary polish. Paraphrases would read better, but would inevitably reflect too much of the translator's personality, and so be unfair to a reader who could not check the rendering by reference to the original.

All the originals were transcribed for publication, but unfortunately cannot be included in this edition. The cost of printing at the present time would have unduly raised the price of the book. This is much to be regretted, for not many private libraries contain so wide a range of authors. For the same reason other important matter is withheld: among other things, long notes on points of scholarship, a chapter on the history of the terms used in the Creeds to express the Resurrection, a discussion of the extant evidence relating to the belief of the Sadducees, a valuable chapter from S. Macrina on transmigration, and lists of authors and of Scripture texts quoted.

The monotony of a vast mass of quotations on the same subject is broken by thumb-nail sketches of the life-history of the authors quoted, and by brief introductions to the different periods. The object is to place the authors in relation to their own period, and to relate the periods to general Church history.

Immense pains have been taken, by checking and rechecking, to present the references with accuracy, but experience of books of the highest reputation has shown such evidence of human frailty in that respect, that this volume cannot hope to be exempt. Notification of any oversight will be gratefully received, care of the publishers.

This treatise is the result of the life-study and experience of a busy parish priest. It is meant to be of use to the

[1] The investigation into the history and meaning of "flesh" in the Bible had been completed before *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh* reached me. This important work by Professor Burton, of Chicago University, is another welcome sign that the Universities of U.S.A. are taking a real hand in literary research work. It is a profound satisfaction that this scholarly work of Professor Burton's confirmed the results of my own investigation in every particular.

parochial clergy in their dealing with a subject much canvassed at the present time, and to theological students in preparation for their sublime vocation. The educated general reader may find answers to many questions which agitate contemporary thought. He would be well advised after reading the first five chapters to read the last three, before plunging into the sea of quotations which covers the sixth to fourteenth chapters. And, finally, it is hoped that the scholar will not disdain to read a treatise which has him constantly in mind, though technical language is avoided as much as possible, and explanations are sometimes given which to him are superfluous. Any scholar not familiar with Athenagoras, Methodius, or Aphraates will appreciate the attention given to those writers.

It remains only to discharge the pleasant duty of acknowledging gratefully the kind help of many friends, and first and foremost of the staff of S. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, where seventeen happy months have been spent, under ideal conditions for study, in verifying quotations and in the other work incidental to writing this book. My obligations to the Warden, the Rev. J. C. Du Buisson, are innumerable. He has read through each portion as it was completed and made most valuable suggestions and criticisms. The Assistant Librarian, the Rev. Paul Levertoff, late Professor of Old Testament and Rabbinics at the Institutum Delitzschianum in connection with Leipzig University, has grudged no pains to put me abreast of the latest developments of the best German scholarship on Biblical questions. His own projected work on Eschatology is eagerly awaited by all who know his profound acquaintance with the best literature, ancient and modern, on the subject. The Rev. H. Danby, the late Sub-Warden, and now of S. George's College, Jerusalem, allowed me to lay his scholarship under contribution at all points, and especially on Aphraates, whom he is editing. My old friend and colleague, the Rev. A. H. Trevor Benson, of Moxley, Wednesbury, has gone through the whole work and offered much useful criticism. The Rev. Father Puller, S.S.J.E., and Dr. McNeile, Regius Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin, have

earned my gratitude by kindly going through the whole of the Appendices and the earlier part of the patristic chapters and noting points that needed further consideration. To them all, and to others who helped in a less degree, I am profoundly grateful, particularly to Mr. J. C. Cowgill, now of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, for verifying some classical quotations and suggesting others.

The index is due to the kindness of the Rev. and Mrs. Paul Levertoff, who have also corrected the proofs.

The Greek and Latin texts used, unless when otherwise mentioned, are the Benedictine Edition referred to as P. L. (*Patrologia Latina*) or P. G. (*Patrologia Græca*). Aphraates is quoted from the superb edition by Dom Parisot, in Graffin's *Patrologia Syriaca*. The Hebrew Bible used was sometimes Kittel's and sometimes Ginsburg's edition; the Septuagint, Swete's Cambridge edition; New Testament, the Revisers' Greek. The Revisers' version is used throughout for consistency's sake, though it is sometimes halting. The editions of other works quoted are sufficiently indicated as the quotations occur.

This attempt to set forth the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body as its own sufficient vindication is now given to the public in the hope that it may serve somewhat to clarify men's minds on this important subject. If there is one word written that is contrary to the mind of Christ as declared by His Church, it is unreservedly withdrawn.

JOHN T. DARRAGH.

S. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden.
Lent, 1920.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	PREFACE	v
I.	PRIMITIVE INTIMATIONS	1
II.	HEBREW APPROACH TO THE DOCTRINE	17
III.	THE DOCTRINE FULLY DISCLOSED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	37
IV.	THE DOCTRINE PREACHED TO A HOSTILE WORLD ...	52
V.	SURVIVAL OF PAGAN CONTEMPT FOR THE BODY AMONG CHRISTIANS	59
VI.	THE DOCTRINE IN THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE	70
VII.	THE WITNESS OF THE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL AND OF TERTULLIAN	87
VIII.	EARLY CHURCH TEACHING OUTSIDE THE ROMAN EMPIRE ...	109
IX.	EASTERN TEACHING IN ANTE-NICENE PERIOD	135
X.	WESTERN TEACHING: FOURTH AND BEGINNING OF FIFTH CENTURIES	161
XI.	WESTERN TEACHING: FIFTH TO EIGHTH CENTURY ...	178
XII.	WESTERN TEACHING: NINTH TO TWELFTH CENTURY ...	189
XIII.	WESTERN TEACHING: THE SCHOLASTICS—FIRST STAGE ...	197
XIV.	WESTERN TEACHING: THE SCHOLASTICS—SECOND STAGE ...	202
XV.	WESTERN TEACHING: REFORMATION	212
XVI.	LATER TEACHING IN THE HISTORICAL CHURCHES ...	224
XVII.	THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE AND THE RISEN BODY ...	254
XVIII.	MORAL DYNAMIC OF THE DOCTRINE	261

APPENDICES

A.	"FLESH" IN THE HEBREW BIBLE	275
B.	"FLESH" IN THE SEPTUAGINT	279
C.	"FLESH" IN THE DEUTERO-CANONICAL BOOKS	284
D.	"FLESH" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	286
E.	THE GREEK WORDS FOR "RESURRECTION"	309
	INDEX	321

THE RESURRECTION OF THE FLESH

CHAPTER I

PRIMITIVE INTIMATIONS

LOOKING back from the vantage ground of a fully developed institution, doctrine, or custom, we can generally recognise some prophetic movement which pointed to the future, though the tendency was quite unrecognised in the earlier stages. The warnings of a coming illness often unheeded, the seeds of decay in a prosperous society not noticed until the collapse is imminent, the faint stirrings which herald the advent of spring, offer familiar illustrations of the general principle.

The Christian religion is no exception to the rule. It has its roots firmly in the past, though it makes strong claims on the present and looks forward confidently to the future. Being a historical religion, and not the fruit of philosophic speculation, that is inevitable. What is true of it as a whole applies to its main doctrines, and not least to that of the resurrection of the flesh. "The Preparation for the Gospel" has been worked out again and again, since S. Clement of Alexandria, at the end of the second century, assigned that dignified position to Greek philosophy. But only in our own day have the materials accumulated which enable us to see that primitive man was dimly feeling after an honourable future for the body. Anthropology has gathered together such a mass of information about the customs and beliefs of our distant forbears that it would require a library to itself, if the volumes written on the subject were to be housed together. A useful treatise will one day be devoted

to setting forth the indications that primitive man has left on record of the manner in which he dimly reached out towards the truth of the body's resurrection.[1] There is only space here for the very briefest mention of what would form the principal headings of such a volume.

(*a*) The identification of the person with the body was associated with the sense of survival after death, and so imparted a glimmering notion that somehow or other the body belongs to that other life as well as to this. Dr. Munro, who writes the article on Pre-historic European burials in Hastings' *Encyclopædia*, speaking of Palæolithic man, says :—

> Formerly it was commonly held among anthropologists that the Palæolithic people had no religion. But a fresh examination of old materials, and some more recent discoveries, supply data which modify this deduction, if, indeed, they do not altogether prove the contrary (vol. iv. p. 464).

He develops this conclusion and finds himself able to assert of the Transition period between Palæolithic and Neolithic man :—

> By this time the sepulchral materials are overwhelmingly conclusive in support of the doctrine that religiosity and a belief in a future life were the dominating factors in the social organisations of the period. During the Neolithic [2] period the cult of the dead, prevalent among the peoples of Western Europe, was the outcome of psychological ideas which linked human affairs with the souls of men, animals, and things in the spirit world. . . . There can be no doubt that the religion of these pre-historic

[1] The general reader will find all that is necessary for forming a sound judgment on the question in Tylor, in Frazer's *Golden Bough* and his other works ; and in outline in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. iv. article "Death and the Disposal of the Dead," pp. 411–511.

These closely packed 100 folio pages are written by nineteen recognised experts. Each writer ends up with a bibliography, which will enable the student to pursue any department of the subject in greater detail.

[2] The dates of this, as of the preceding periods, belong to geologic time. The first certain traces of men are found in the Pleistocene age, which throws man's origin back to tens of thousands of years, before he was advanced enough to record his thoughts and doings in inscriptions. The earliest inscribed records of Babylonia date from about 4000 B.C., and of Egypt 3500 B.C., though a civilisation considerably earlier is indicated before the existing records were fashioned.

peoples, as disclosed by their sepulchral remains, involved a belief in intercommunications between mankind and the supernatural world. When a prominent man died, his weapons, ornaments, and other cherished objects were placed in his tomb along with suitable viands for his supposed journey to the Unseen World. . . . The selected grave-goods were appropriate to the standing and tastes of the individual, so much so that on this ground alone the graves of distinguished men, women, and children are readily recognisable. Such facts undoubtedly suggest that the people of those times did not regard life beyond the grave as differing widely from that on earth. To them death was the portal to the community of departed heroes and friends, to which they looked forward, across the span of human life, with hopeful anticipation of a more perfect state of existence. . . . The attentions paid to the dead before, at, and subsequent to the burial disclose a wide field of speculative research, involving the foundations of religion, ancestor-worship, and general cult of the dead (*ib.* p. 465).

The sense of religion, inferred from the respect shown to the body in burial, argues some idea of the survival of the personality after death. The personal "I" is barely, if at all, distinguished from the body by primitive man. This early tendency has survived in popular language to this day. We have only to notice our common methods of speech to see how persistent is the close association of the personality with the body. "You are hurting me." "You do look ill." "We buried him yesterday." Such expressions refer to the body or bodily conditions, and show how ingrained is the habit of connecting the body with the idea of personality.[1] This naïve usage, which the most learned share with simple folk, is particularly noticeable in the Old and New Testaments. The Hebrew bias in that direction is well illustrated in the Morning Benediction [2] of the Jewish Prayer Book, which verbally distinguishes the personality from the soul and connects it with the body :—

O God, the soul which Thou hast set within me is pure. Thou

[1] Cf. the Burial Service in the Prayer Book, "our dear brother here departed"; "it hath pleased Thee to deliver this our brother"; "as our hope is this our brother doth."

[2] Taken from *Ber.* 60b., and therefore of great age.

hast fashioned it. Thou hast breathed it into me, and Thou dost keep it within me, and wilt take it from me and restore it to me in time to come. As long as it is within me, I will give homage to Thee, O Divine Master, Lord of all spirits, who givest back the soul to dead bodies.[1]

The New Testament uniformly adopts the popular mode of expression. Of dead Lazarus our Lord says: *Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep.* Martha's words are very simple: *Lord, by this time he stinketh; for he hath been dead four days* (John xi. 11, 39).

(*b*) All the evidence points to man's obstinate disbelief[2] in the necessity of death in spite of universal experience. He felt that dissociation from his body was unnatural and intolerable. He shows this in two ways. He attributes the entrance of death into the world to trivial, accidental, or unintended causes,[3] and looks upon sickness and death in individual cases as the result of hostile agency from without —a curse, a spell, witchcraft. The survival of the belief that magic is at the bottom of all sickness is universal among the races of the lower culture, and has only died out very slowly, if it is indeed quite extinct, among civilised and even Christian peoples.

(*c*) In all the accounts of wraiths, ghosts, or apparitions, which have been current amongst the various races of mankind, we always hear of the departed presenting themselves

[1] Notice the traditional belief in the resurrection of the body. In some Jewish circles at present there is a tendency to go back from this teaching. See *The Jewish Encyclopædia*, vol. x. p. 385. Friedländer in *Jewish Religion* leaves the question open. The thirteenth Principle in the Jewish Creed is: "I firmly believe in the resurrection of the dead at the time it shall please the Creator, Blessed be He." Friedländer's comment is: "Whether the soul will enjoy a second life on earth united with the body, and if so, how and when this re-union will take place, is unknown to us" (pp. 51–2). Notice "a second life on earth united with the body." No other alternative is recognised. The Christian conception of the body becoming spiritual is ignored. The older teaching is clear: "God will give to the Messiah the Key (κλεῖδα) of the Resurrection," *Sanh.* 113th, *Berech*, on chap. lxxiii. According to Rabbi Levi ben Gershom (on Deut. xxxiv. 10) the Messiah will lead the Gentiles to the only true God through His power of raising the dead; cf. 1 Thess. iv. 14 ff.

[2] Cf. L. W. King and H. R. Hall, *Egypt and Western Asia in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, p. 68.

[3] E. S. Hartland sketches these in *Encycl.* "Rel. and Ethics," vol. iv. pp. 411–12.

in their appearance and habit as they lived. However unsubstantial the ghost might prove to be, there is at least a semblance of the body, so hard did the human imagination find it to picture the spirit divorced from the body. In fact, it is only when speculation is far advanced that we come across the Greek philosophic idea of the existence in the next world of pure spirit. The speculation of the East conceives of the absorption of the human spirit into the Divine, but the higher Greek philosophy evolved the idea of a continued personal existence, in which the spirit leads a conscious life entirely dissociated from the body. It is doubtful, however, if this conception penetrated far beyond academic circles. The immortality of the soul apart from the body is unknown to the Scriptures, unless it be found in the Book of Wisdom, but that is strongly tinged with Greek thought.[1]

(*d*) Above all, the burial customs of mankind, in all their infinite variety, bear witness to an ineradicable instinct of respect for the bodies of the dead. Man could not bring himself to believe that the spirit had finished and done with its body. The greatness of the calamity that at a man's death there should be " no man to bury him " was intensely felt and was widespread. The Greek and Latin poets make great use of the idea.[2] The Encyclopædia, already quoted, expresses the feeling in these terms :—

> Until the funeral rites are ended, the soul is not finally dismissed to its place in the other world, it is not united to the company of the fathers, it is not elevated to its due position in the household or tribal cult, and it continues to haunt the survivors unpleasantly. This belief is little short of universal in the lower culture (vol. iv. p. 459).

The ancestor-worship, so-called, which roughly answers to the Christian doctrine of the Communion of Saints, starts with the honours bestowed on the bodies of dead relations. Confucianism, which is, on the whole, so pedestrian a philosophy of this present life, is redeemed by the immense

[1] See pp. 30 and 275, n. 2.

[2] Cf. Homer, *Odyssey*, xi. 51–80; Sophocles, *Antigone*, 255–6, 401; Vergil, *Æneid*, vi. 149–55, 313–30, 363–71, 505–10; Horace, *Odes*, i. 28, 21 *sq.*

importance it attaches to the honourable disposal of the body after death.[1]

The immense pains, trouble, and expense that the survivors were at to carry out the funeral rites "decently and in order," and to mark the last resting-place of the body, are to be observed everywhere, but the methods adopted differed with the date, the country, the race, the religion of the people.[2] It is pathetic to read of the sacrifices that families were ready to make for the honourable disposal of their dead. This is apparent in the very dawn of human history, and is to-day observed with equal lavishness in China, Japan, and India, and among the peoples of the lower culture as well. Nor is it extinct in the modern, more utilitarian life of peoples who specially claim for themselves the title of civilised. If ostentation has more and more disappeared from the obsequies of the cultured, the painful, lifelong provision for a decent funeral is a mark of self-respecting poverty—a survival of one of the commonest instincts of primitive mankind of which we have incontestable evidence. It is not contended that this world-wide and age-long custom of our race bears explicit testimony to a belief in the resurrection of the body. But taken together with the considerations above mentioned, it may fairly be adduced as showing a dim sense that the connection between soul and body is not definitely and for ever severed by death.

(*e*) A more distinct foregleam of "the life and incorruption brought to light by the Gospel" is afforded at a very early date in Egypt and Babylonia, the countries of whose history in long-distant ages we have the fullest knowledge.

(1) There is an immense and growing literature dealing with the history and religion of the ancient inhabitants of the Nile valley, who have left us enduring records of their acts and thoughts over a period stretching from 3500 B.C.

[1] See R. K. Douglas, *Confucianism and Taoism*, pp. 79–82; and cf. Giles, *Confucianism and its Rivals*, p. 76; and *Religions of Ancient China*, pp. 28–32.

[2] A useful summary of the widely different customs will be found in the Encyclopædia already quoted: Pre-historic, Babylonian, Egyptian, etc., pp. 411–511.

to the time that their descendants exchanged their inherited customs for the Christian faith and practice. Naturally their customs and their explanation of them did not remain absolutely uniform over so long a space of time, and their modern historians find it no easy matter to extract a coherent theory of what exactly was understood at any given period by the things that were done and said.

Rawlinson and Budge, in their many volumes, aim rather at supplying the reader with materials for forming a judgment than at framing one themselves, but they agree in seeing that the costly process of embalmment, and the laborious monuments and temples to contain the mummified bodies—like the Pyramids—were designed to perpetuate the body as still in some sense to be at the disposal and for the use of the soul. P. D. Scott-Moncrieff, writing in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (vol. iv. p. 454), expresses the accepted belief of scholars thus :—

> The chief concern of the pagan Egyptian had been the preservation of the bodies of the dead by embalming,[1] so that the spirit of the deceased might pass to and fro between the Kingdom of Osiris and the earthly shell which lay in the tomb.[2]

H. R. Hall, in the same volume (pp. 458-9), carries the interpretation of the Egyptian sacred texts a considerable step further, and shows how near the later Egyptian mystics came to anticipating the Christian doctrine of the resurrection :—

> The chief peculiarity of the Egyptian burial customs is the artificial preservation of the body. No doubt in later times a theory of resurrection was adopted, according to which, after a space of three thousand years, the several parts of a man—his

[1] Cf. Naville, *The Old Egyptian Faith*, p. 60: "What caused the Egyptians to cling so tenaciously to the idea of the preservation of the body was their belief that its destruction involved the destruction of the immaterial element. It meant the annihilation of the individual, and in particular, of one of the elements of personality, the double that subsisted in the life beyond the tomb."

[2] Mr. Moncrieff goes on to say that "the Christian and pagan doctrine of the resurrection had so much in common." That, no doubt, is true of some later speculations of the Egyptian sages, but the form described by him has little or no relation to the Christian doctrine of the transformed spiritual body.

ikhu or spark of intelligence which had rejoined the gods, his *ba* or birdlike soul which fluttered around the tomb, his *khaibit* or shadow, and the *Ka* or double of him, which was born with him and accompanied him on earth during life and in the tomb during death—rejoined his *sahu* or noble and venerable mummy, which had lain so long in solitary majesty in the tomb, and then the whole man rose again from the dead.[1] But it is not clear that this actual man was to live again on earth as he had lived before. He was to live with the gods rather. According to another theory, the *sahu* was not the actual mummy, but a sort of spiritual body which germinated in the *khat*, or corruptible body, and sprang up out of it just as the wheat springs out of the seed : so the dead Osiris gave birth to a new living Osiris. It was in this *sahu* that the concomitant parts of the man were reunited. A symbol of this belief is found in many tombs ; it is a figure of Osiris on his bier, made of earth, in which seed was sown just before the burial : as we find it now, we see the wheat [2] which grew up and withered in the dark. The two different ways of regarding the *sahu* probably arose from two different ideas of the actual dead body. In one aspect it was a mere dead thing, not different from a dead fish—the *Khat* of a man like the *Khat* of a fish—and was expressed in the hieroglyphic writing by the figure of a dead fish. But in another aspect [3] it was a fearful and wonderful thing—the *sahu*, dwelling in majestic loneliness and silence in the tomb, and endued with marvellous magical powers, which naturally included the power of summoning back to it at will the departed principles of life and intelligence, the shadow, the heart, and the name, ever regarded with awe by primitive races. So the *sahu* is represented as the human mummy lying on its bier. The two ideas were combined in later times by regarding the *sahu* as a spiritual body (which originally it was not), which sprang from the *Khat*. The *Khat* was simply the profane name for a dead body of any kind. In the oldest religion, when the actual human

[1] This revivifying of the actual dead body is something quite different from the Christian conception of resurrection. The Christian believes that the actual physical body undergoes a complete change and becomes spiritual.

[2] Did S. Paul know of this custom when he wrote 1 Cor. xv. 36–7 ?

[3] According to Blackman the libations in Egyptian ceremonial were meant to revivify the dry corpse of the deceased. The vital fluids that had exuded from it in the process of mummification must be restored, for not till then will life return and the heart beat again. This, so the earliest texts of the Sakkara Pyramids of the fifth and sixth dynasties show us, was believed to be accomplished by offering libations (*Zeitschrift für Ägypt. Sprache*, vol. 50 (1912), p. 69).

mummy was alluded to, it was called the *sahu*, and one prayed to the gods to allow the *ba* to re-enter the *sahu* and revivify it, so that it could feed upon the offerings which its descendants brought to it. It was probably out of this idea that the conception of a resurrection, whether of a spiritual *sahu*, or of the actual man, grew.[1]

This second theory, so clearly described by Mr. Hall, is startlingly akin to the Christian idea of resurrection placed before us by S. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. It is important, therefore, that the reader should not be dependent on the opinion of one expert, however eminent. Other writers of authority are quoted briefly, in order that the results of investigation into Egyptian religion may be seen as they have mirrored themselves in different minds.

Professor Sayce writes thus in *The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia* (p. 167) :—

How came this doctrine of the resurrection to be attached to the cult of Osiris, and to become an integral part of Egyptian belief? There is only one answer that can be given to this: the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was a necessary accompaniment of the practice of mummification, and Osiris was a mummified God. . . . He [*i.e.* Osiris] became for them Unnefer, "the good being" ready to heal for them even the pains of death, and to receive them in his realm beyond the grave, where life and action would be restored to them. The sun shone there as it did here, for was not Osiris the sun-God? The fields of the blessed were those of Egypt, except that no sickness or death came near them, that no blight ever fell on the fruit or the corn, that the Nile never failed, and that the heat was always tempered by the northern breeze. . . . Here the dead lived in perpetual happiness under the rule of Osiris, working, feasting, reading, even fighting as in the world below, only without pain, and eternally. In order to share in this state of bliss, it was necessary for the believer to become like the God himself[2] (*ib.* 168–9).

The mummy lay in the tomb: the immortal counterpart of the man himself was in another or a spiritual world. The result was inevitable: the follower of Osiris soon assured himself that

[1] Cf. Flinders Petrie on the nature of the Ka, *Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt*, p. 179.

[2] Cf. A. Erman, *Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, pp. 95–100; and A. Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, chap. ix., especially p. 254.

one day the mummified body also would have life and action again breathed into it and would rejoin its Osiris in the fields of Paradise. Had not the god carried thither his divine body as well as its counterpart? And what the god had done those who had become even as he was could also do.

In this way the doctrine of the resurrection of the body became an integral part of the Osirian faith. The future happiness to which its disciples looked forward was not an absorption into the divinity, or contemplation of the divine attributes, or a monotonous existence of passive idleness. They were to live as they had lived in this life, only without sorrow and suffering, without sin, and eternally. But all their bodily powers and interests were to remain and to be gratified as they could not be in this lower world. The realm over which Osiris ruled was the idealised reproduction of that Egypt which the Egyptian loved so well, with its sunshine and light, its broad and life-giving river, its fertile fields and its busy towns. These who dwelt in it could indeed feast and play, could lounge in canoes, and fish or hunt, could read tales and poems, or write treatises on morality, could transform themselves into birds that alighted among the thick foliage of the trees; but they must also work as they had done here, must cultivate the soil before it would produce its ears of wheat two cubits high, must submit to the corvée and embank the canals. The Osirian heaven had no place for the idle and inactive [1] (*ib.* 170–1).

Sir J. G. Frazer, in *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris*, bears similar testimony:—

In the resurrection of Osiris the Egyptians saw the pledge of life everlasting for themselves beyond the grave. They believed that every man would live eternally in the other world, if only his surviving friends did for his body what the gods had done for the body of Osiris (vol. ii. p. 13, ed. 1904).

. . . Thus the resurrection of the dead was conceived, like that of Osiris, not merely as spiritual, but also as bodily (*ib.* p. 16).

. . . However, in later times, the body with which the dead came to life was believed to be a spiritual, not a material, body (*ib.* p. 16, notes).

(2) All the authorities agree that when one turns from

[1] Cf. Naville, *The Old Egyptian Faith*, p. 73, and as a contrast see p. 207 of the same book.

the records of Egyptian religion to those of Babylonia, a different atmosphere is felt at once. Professor Sayce expresses this with his usual felicity :—

To the Egyptian the present life was but a preparation for the next ; not only the spiritual elements of which he was composed, but, as he hoped, his body also would survive beyond the grave. It was otherwise in Babylonia. No traces of mummification are to be found there ; at most we hear of the corpse being anointed for death, as it were, with oil and honey ; and cremation, partial or complete, seems to have been practised. The thoughts of the Babylonian were fixed rather on this world than the next ; his horizon, speaking generally, was bounded by death. It was in this world that he had relations with the gods and duties towards them, and it was here that he was rewarded or punished for the deeds committed in the flesh. The practical character of the Babylonians did not lend itself to dreams and speculations about the future ; the elaborate map of the other world, which is drawn in the sacred books of Egypt, would have been impossible for them. They were too much absorbed in commerce and trade and the practical pursuit of wealth to have leisure for theories that concerned themselves with a doubtful future and an invisible world. The shadow of the old religion of Nippur, moreover, with its underground Hades of darkness and gloom rested to the last on the mind of the Babylonian people. The brighter views which have emanated from Eridu never succeeded in overcoming it altogether. The gods of light ruled, indeed, over a world that once belonged to the demons of night, but their victory never extended further. The land of Hades continued to be a land of darkness,[1] even though the waters of life gushed up from below the golden throne of spirits who dwelt there. We find no conception in Babylonian literature parallel to the Egyptian fields of Alu, no judgment hall of Hades before which the conscience of the dead man is arraigned. The Babylonian was judged in this life, and not in the next, and the god who judged him was the sun-god of day, and not the dead sun-god of the other world.[2]

This contrast between the outlook of the two most famous civilisations, which were concurrent in point of time and were often in close contact and communication with one

[1] Cf. L. W. King, *Babylonian Religion and Mythology*, pp. 35-7.
[2] *The Religion of Ancient Egypt and Babylon*, pp. 294-5.

another, is without doubt striking in the extreme. Maspero, in his *Dawn of Civilisation*, draws an even more gloomy picture of the Babylonian ideas [1] concerning the world into which they, in common with all ancient peoples, believed that men's souls went after death. He concludes his depressing account (pp. 691–6) with the following words :—

As for the mass of humanity, their religion gave them the choice between a perpetual abode in the tomb, or confinement in the prison of Allat [2] ; if at times they strove to escape from these alternatives, and to picture otherwise their condition in the world beyond, their ideas as to the other life continued to remain vague, and never approached the precision of the Egyptian conception. The cares of the present life were too absorbing to allow them leisure to speculate upon the conditions of a future existence.

That is all cheerless enough. But indications are not wanting that younger scholars are unwilling to endorse this verdict without some reservations. Mr. S. Langdon, not the least brilliant of the newer school, so far agrees that Maspero's judgment had some foundation. We find him, *e.g.* writing thus :—

"The land of the dead" is described as "the land of no return." Arallu or Aralu, a Sumerian word, which means "place of desolation." Also "the house of darkness.[3] . . . According to the poem describing the descent of Ishtar to search for Tammuz, Aralu is a land without light, where dust is the only food and solitude reigns supreme.[4]

[1] But more modern students of the Babylonian records question Maspero's competence to speak with authority in this department of archæology. An expert in Egyptology, he had only partially investigated the then available records of Babylonia, and much has been deciphered since he wrote the *Dawn of Civilisation*. Jeremias has embodied a great deal of fresh material in *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, English edition, 1911.

[2] Yet see Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, p. 53. He is interpreting an inscribed prayer, addressed to Merodach (Marduk), and incidentally speaks thus: "To all appearance, the preserving of one's individuality, in the abodes of bliss after death, was with them [*i.e.* the Assyrians and Babylonians] an essential to the reality of that life beyond the grave."

[3] Yet he notes elsewhere that it is also known as "the house of resting," *Tammuz and Ishtar*, p. 52, and that the life there is "a sleep," *ib.* pp. 15 and 54.

[4] *Babyloniaca*, Tom. vi. 4, p. 210.

. . . In this doctrine [*i.e.* that Tammuz is a god of health] there seems to be no reference to immortality or deliverance from eternal sleep in Sheol. The Babylonians had no such hope. . . . He is called the healer only in the sense that all life depends upon his sacrifice, and especially upon his return from hell.[1]

But when all this re-echoing of the older experts is duly noted, there is found to be a more cheerful note struck by Mr. Langdon. The following extracts from *Babyloniaca* will bear this out. We will begin with his comment on the significance of burial customs :—

It is precisely here that we find reflected the deeper spiritual conceptions of eschatology, for ritual is the surest and most fruitful source in studying the deeper problems of religion.[2]

. . . Although the ancient Sumerians, whose beliefs were transmitted to the Semites, conceived of an immediate separation of body and soul at mortal dissolution, the latter passing at once to *Arallu*, the land of the dead, but the soul or *edimmu* maintained a lively interest in the body which it had left behind. In fact, the future happiness of the soul depended largely upon the proper care being given to its abandoned body.[3]

. . . The living not only buried their dead according to the customs dictated by their eschatological ideas, but they continued to make regular offerings at their tombs or graves. The relation between a man and his ancestors was not severed at the grave. A decent burial constituted only the necessary beginning of a happy existence in *Arallu ;* the soul's happy existence could not continue unless its kinsmen performed for it the necessary rites. Inasmuch as those souls whose bodies failed to receive proper burial rose from hell [4] to torment mankind, and especially their own neglectful descendants, the offerings for the repose of the souls formed an important part of Sumerian and Babylonian religious practice. We shall see from the numerous ancient sources now at our disposal that a general offering was provided in the official religion to appease the souls of the dead. We have here truly the primitive conception of a feast of All Souls.[5]

[1] *Tammuz and Ishtar*, pp. 33–4.
[2] *Babyloniaca*, Tom. vi. 4, p. 193.
[3] *Ib.* p. 197.
[4] Note that "hell" is used in its older sense, as in the Creed=the place of the departed, not the place of punishment.
[5] *Ib.* p. 199.

. . . Thus we see that the soul was nourished in *Arallu* by the Memorial meals consumed in his memory by his kinsmen on earth.[1]

. . . This weird conception which peopled *Arallu* with spirits who were capable of interfering with the affairs of men, and upon whose good will the happiness of the living largely depended.[2] . . .

. . . Our inferences are not altogether certain, yet we may perhaps assume that the parentalia [3] or solemn meal in memory of the dead formed the essential act necessary for the repose of the soul. The general parentalia or meal for all souls took place on the first, second, or third days . . . at the beginning of the fifth and seventh months.[4]

. . . The fundamental concept of Babylonian eschatology is the inseparableness of the living and the dead. The welfare of the living depended largely upon the care which they bestowed on their departed kinsmen. Although these disappeared from the sight of man, yet their souls communed with them at the solemn parentalia in the Temples, or at their graves. Some change of ritual may have taken place, but they found no higher revelation of the whither of the soul than this. No trace of a resurrection,[5] no promise of a change in the monotonous and silent existence in hell.[6]

Yet note that the idea of a resurrection is found by Mr. Langdon in the story of Tammuz and Ishtar. The following quotations show this :—

. . . The mysteries of the death and resurrection of the youthful God.[7] . . .

. . . The worship of Tammuz in Babylonia and in those

[1] *Babyloniaca*, Tom. vi. 4, pp. 202–3.

[2] *Ib.* p. 205.

[3] *I.e.* the periodical observances in memory of relations and especially of parents.

[4] *Ib.* p. 206.

[5] Yet Jeremias finds evidence that the moon, " because of its continual return to life," had suggested " resurrection from the dead," *op. cit.* pp. 22, 30, 309, of vol. i., and speaks of the mystic connection of solemnities in honour of the dead with the celebration of the death and resurrection of the God of the year, as shown in the worship of Tammuz, *ib.* p. 84. Compare Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, p. 44, where he notes that one title of Merodach (Marduk), the chief divinity, was " he who raises the dead to life."

[6] *Ib.* p. 213.

[7] *Tammuz and Ishtar*, p. 6.

adjacent lands to which it spread was a cult of sorrow,[1] death, and resurrection. . . . Tammuz the dying and resurrected God.[2]

. . . He appears at the dawn of history, certainly before 3000 B.C., as a figure already established in the Sumerian pantheon.[3]

. . . It would not be venturesome to affirm that this mystic cult of death and resurrection is one of the earliest forms of worship known to us, and as far as our sources permit us to speak, precedes the lower form of incantation and magic. Theological speculation, accompanied by a corresponding tendency to asceticism and mysticism, apparently preceded certain grosser types of magic, to which the frailty of man so often inclines in later stages of a given culture.[4]

. . . Still they are reaching out, blindly it is true, but with a genuine religious sense towards the hope of eternal life.[5]

. . . There is abundant evidence that this hope [viz. that a mortal might "really attain to a heaven at last"] occupied a prominent place towards the end of the Babylonian Empire, and in certain quarters may have become a positive belief.[6]

. . . His liturgies [*i.e.* those of Tammuz] suggest the actual death and resurrection of a material god.[7]

It will be noted that, with all their scientific caution, these utterances give a more hopeful tinge to the Babylonian religion than the inspissated gloom of Maspero and the older generation of Assyriologists. The importance of the newer interpretation of the records lies in this. The close connection of the Hebrews with Babylonia naturally invests all that is known concerning the religious beliefs of their country of origin with extraordinary interest. Dr. Charles and all his school read the Old Testament in the light of Babylonian antiquities, as set out a generation ago by scholars of whom Maspero is the best known to English readers. Their whole view of Biblical eschatology is coloured by the conclusions of the older Assyriologists, which they accepted wholeheartedly. Now that it is becoming evident that those conclusions are not maintaining in all respects their hitherto unchallenged position, it is time that the vogue of Biblical critics who relied implicitly on the older interpretation

[1] Cf. Ezek. viii. 14.
[2] *Tammuz and Ishtar*, p. 1.
[3] *Ib.* p. 2.
[4] *Ib.* p. 3.
[5] *Ib.* p. 14.
[6] *Ib.* p. 41.
[7] *Ib.* p. 183.

should receive a check. The younger men have all the old evidence and some new before them. Yet with all their reverence for the great pioneers, they find themselves obliged to modify some of the earlier readings of the records.

Summing up, therefore, this short sketch of a vast subject, we find that God left not Himself without witness to the great truth, which in the fulness of time was to be clearly revealed. Man through all the ages had been groping his way towards the truth implied in his inveterate customs, and in his wistful conjectures regarding the future of his body.

Whether this universal anticipation by primitive man of the Gospel doctrine of the resurrection was the outcome of some primeval revelation, or was the fruit of his innate powers of observation and reflection, it is futile to discuss in the absence of full knowledge. Putting aside such discussions, we can be sure of this. God knew from the beginning that these obstinate questionings would arise, and how He intended to satisfy them. When He embarked on the Great Adventure of creation, and of crowning it with a being endowed with free-will, He for a time limited Himself indeed by His own act, but He never withdrew Himself from the creatures of His hand. He has Eternity before Him, in which to guide to the desired end men's falterings and failures without impairing their freedom.

The development of man was, by God's own gift, conditioned by his free-will. We mostly think of man's free-will as operating only in the region of moral choice. But in thought also, and in the discovery and the apprehension of truth, there is room for the exercise of this great gift. God has so tempered the mind of man, and so ordered his environment, that no truth, which really matters to his spiritual development, overbears his freedom to accept or reject it. God will have willing believers of His great truths. He will, too, have men arrive at them by degrees. This is as true of the race as it is certainly true of the individual. The believer is constantly growing in the realisation of the truths he learnt at his mother's knee, and the will as well as the intellect is engaged in the process.

CHAPTER II

HEBREW APPROACH TO THE DOCTRINE

HAVING glanced at the foreshadowings of the body's destiny which man's own intuitions and aspirations afforded him, not, we believe, without God's guidance and leading, we now go on to a brief analysis of the Old Testament teaching on the subject. This naturally falls into two parts: the Canonical books, and the Deutero-canonical, commonly called the Apocrypha. With the latter we group, for convenience' sake, other Jewish literature which was composed after the close of the Canon, and which never attained to even the secondary rank.

A. *The Old Testament.*—The student who approaches the Old Testament, fresh from contemporary records of human thought and speculation outside the Holy Land, is at once struck with the Bible's reticence regarding the future life altogether. To some it is even a difficulty that Revelation should be less explicit on the most interesting of all subjects than the religions of Egypt and Babylonia. Though the reticence is by no means so great as some critics would have us think, it is sufficiently remarkable to require a few words of explanation.

The Hebrews did not derive their entire religious knowledge from the inspired books that happened to be in existence at the time. They shared in the common religious inheritance of the human race, and more particularly in that of their country of origin, Babylonia, and of Egypt. They were in close and constant communication with both lands, and could not be ignorant of the doctrines regarding the future life, which were current there. It would be absurd to regard them as devoid of the general knowledge of their

times and having to acquire it all by inspiration, as if they had newly come into the world and had no connection with the men of old or of other races. That is not how inspiration works. It usually takes what already exists and moulds it to a better end and clearer purpose.

Observe how God deals with the Jewish people in this connection. Their general religious belief regarding the future life is neither affirmed nor denied, nor is another better and fuller belief substituted for it straight away. God uses their religious genius and religious experience, as they gradually drew nearer to Him, by way of a filter-bed, as it were, to cleanse the turbid waters of tradition from elements which had associated themselves with it but were really alien to it. Amongst the surrounding nations, belief in the future life and the observances connected with it were mixed up with Polytheism and many superstitious practices.[1] These had to be purged away before the doctrine could take its place in the inspired pages. There is no violent action. God can and does act catastrophically when He pleases. But for the most part, His action is patient, quiet, gradual. When the fulness of the time is come, as we shall see in this as in other cases, the doctrine of the resurrection is enunciated, free from accretions and in a far clearer and more spiritual form. It was not yet full-orbed. It had yet to wait for its full expression, until the Son of Man rose again from the dead, and gave an example of what a risen body is like, so that what we have no personal experience of, and consequently cannot understand, should be rendered intelligible, so far as is possible in this life.

We need not be astonished, then, that the references to the future life in the Old Testament are guarded, and that the idea of the resurrection emerges comparatively late in Jewish history.

The references to a future life in Genesis are in line with general primitive tradition, as far as they go, but they do not go very far. The chief passages occur in chapter xv. 15 :

[1] Some of these practices are definitely forbidden : *ye shall not cut yourselves nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead* (Deut. xiv. 1). Others were suffered to die out, as the people grew in spiritual consciousness.

Thou [*i.e.* Abraham] *shalt go*[1] *to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age.*

Chapter xxv. 8, 9: *And Abraham gave up the ghost and died in a good old age, an old man and full of years, and was gathered to his people. And Isaac and Ishmael his sons buried him in the cave of Machpelah;*

xxv. 17: *and he* [*i.e.* Ishmael] *gave up the ghost and died, and was gathered unto his people;*

xxxv. 29: *And Isaac gave up the ghost and died and was gathered unto his people;*

xlix. 29, 33: *And he* [*i.e.* Jacob] *charged them and said unto them, I am to be gathered unto my people: bury me with my fathers in the cave that is in the field of Machpelah . . . and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people.*[2]

The phrases "go to thy people," "gathered to his people," are expressly distinguished from "dying" and from "burial." This is especially noticeable in the case of Jacob, whose burial did not take place until many days after he had been "gathered to his people." Driver gives the only natural meaning to the expression—he had gone to join his kinsfolk in the unseen world of Sheol.[3]

This also is the meaning of a similar phrase which occurs

[1] Cf. 1 Chron. xvii. 11.

[2] Cf. the same phrase used of Moses and Aaron in Num. xxvii. 13, and cf. Num. xx. 24, 26, xxxi. 2; Judges ii. 10; Deut. xxxii. 50; 2 Kings xxii. 20; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 28.

[3] Westminster Commentaries, *The Book of Genesis*, p. 394, and cf. notes on xxv. 8 and xv. 15.

"Sheol" occurs upwards of sixty times in the Old Testament. It is translated as "the grave," "the pit," or "hell" in the Authorised Version. The Revisers retain these rather misleading words, and only rarely give Sheol itself, as in Ps. xvi. 10, but when the word is first met in Gen. xxxvii. 35, they add the useful note: "Sheol the Hebrew name of the abode of the dead answering to the Greek Hades, Acts ii. 27."

Sheol never means the literal grave in which a dead body is laid, but as "the grave" in English diction is used figuratively for the end of this mortal life (cf. Blair's Grave), it can with propriety translate Sheol in poetic usage. But it should be remembered that Sheol always means the receptacle of the soul, not of the body. Hence "hell" in its mediæval sense, as in the Creed, was an exact equivalent of "Sheol" in the Old Testament, and of "Hades" in the New. In modern English "hell," which has come to mean "Gehenna," or the abode of the Devil and his angels, is no longer a correct rendering of "Sheol" or "Hades." We have now no English word exactly corresponding to the Hebrew or Greek words, and the only safe way is to use "Sheol" and "Hades" in the Old and New Testaments respectively, to express the abode of spirits after death.

once in Genesis and many times in the Books of Kings and Chronicles. Jacob exacted an oath of Joseph: *bury me not, I pray thee, in Egypt: but when I sleep with my fathers, thou shalt carry me out of Egypt, and bury me in their burying place* (Gen. xlvii. 30). Here again the distinction between "sleeping with his fathers" and his "burial" is unmistakable. Mostly, too, when the expression became a formula used of Kings, the distinction is expressly made; and in the few cases in which the mention of burial is omitted, there is no reason to believe that any difference is intended.[1]

It is to be regretted that so good a scholar as Dr. Charles allows himself to be quoted in favour of an unnatural interpretation of the Biblical text,[2] following in this certain of his favourite German authorities, who take "*slept with his fathers*" as meaning no more than that a man was buried in the ancestral burying place. The mention of the burial as a separate transaction is ignored.

But when the obvious meaning is vindicated, it does not carry us very far. It does no more than show that the Hebrews at an early stage of their development believed, in common with other primitive races, in survival after death and in the foregathering of families in the unseen world. The solidarity of the family was not broken by death. Of the nature of the life in that unseen world or of the Hebrew belief concerning it we are left with nothing beyond these two elementary facts.

Only as communion with God grew keener and deeper did clearer views emerge among the chosen people.

As the distractions of Polytheism died out and the mists of superstition cleared off, they gradually came to realise something of the significance of God's sole sovereignty in heaven and earth. God, Who was so close to His worshipper

[1] The student may find a complete list useful; the texts in which the burial is not mentioned apart from "the sleep with the fathers" are marked with an asterisk: *Deut. xxxi. 16; *2 Sam. vii. 12; *1 Kings i. 21, *xi. 21, xi. 43, *xiv. 20, xiv. 31, xv. 8, 24, xvi. 6, 28, *xxii. 40, xxii. 50; 2 Kings viii. 24, x. 35, xiii. 9, 13, xiv. 16, *xiv. 22, 29, xv. 7, *xv. 22, xv. 38, xvi. 20, *xx. 21, xxi. 18, *xxiv. 6; 2 Chron. ix. 31, xii. 16, xiv. 1, xvi. 13, xxi. 1, *xxvi. 2, xxvi. 23, xxvii. 9, xxviii. 27, xxxii. 33, xxxiii. 20; and cf. Job xiv. 12, xxi. 13; Isa. xiv. 18, xliii. 17; Ezek. xxxii. 27.

[2] See *e.g.* his *Eschatology*, p. 32 (ii).

on earth, could not be thought of as suddenly breaking off relations with him on his departure to that other dim world. By degrees, but only by degrees, was the presence of God felt to be the radiance of that world as of this, and happier conceptions arose of the conditions into which men passed at death. Glimpses of this slow process of spiritual enlightenment are afforded us by the Book of Job and the Psalms. There is no forcing of the pace. The conditions of existence beyond the grave are what they are, independently of men's thoughts about them. God is not in haste to impart fuller knowledge regarding them. He tolerates ignorance, naïve surmises, even bold denials.[1] He knows how and when a ray of light here and a beam there will be beneficial.

The poet and prophet are the agents He employs to diffuse the light, but never so as to stun or dazzle. The interest in the next world must never be such as to divert men from their primary duty which is towards this. Whilst we are here, we owe our first allegiance to God here. No doubt our loyalty or treason here affects our life there, but that should concentrate our attention on the tasks in hand, rather than lead us to neglect them for musings on future calls. When God wants us for the further life and work, He will make His voice heard. He has declared His will to this effect in one unmistakable fashion. He has implanted in man an ineradicable instinct towards life. Death, even when we believe with a whole-hearted sincerity that it will be a change for the better, is rarely welcomed. So deeply is this engraven on man's inmost being that many holy souls are dismayed at their shrinking from death even in extreme old age. They have to be consoled by the vision of Gethsemane. He, the Representative Man, prays that, if it be possible, that cup of humiliation may be removed from Him. Death, though in one way the most natural and inevitable of experiences, is in another felt to be an

[1] Cf. some passages in the Book of Ecclesiastes, which, however, are more an emphatic identification of Sheol with the old Babylonian Arallu, "the land of no-return," than a denial of the soul's survival. The preacher dwells on the obvious fact that the dead came back no more to the joys and activities of the present life.

incredible intrusion.[1] Our God-given instinct resents it and asserts life to be our true portion. Any tendency to spurn God's great gift of life, even in favour of the happier continuation of it in a happier world, is not encouraged anywhere in Testament New or Old.

Two instances of God's commentary in history on too great a pre-occupation with the other life to the neglect of the duties of this may be cited, from heathen and from Christian times. The whole Egyptian civilisation came to be absorbed in the other world—in preparation for it and in performing duties towards those who were already there. The strong hand of Rome swept it away. Mediæval England had given itself up to the saving of men's own souls and those of their friends in the other world—often to the complete neglect of their duty in this, and to complete forgetfulness of their duty to the heathen. It is astonishing how little interest was shown in the evangelisation of the world. God suffered the whole provision for the perpetual remembrance of the dead to be ruthlessly wiped out. So much so that we are only slowly and painfully recovering that sense of solidarity with the departed and of our duty towards them, which had been exaggerated out of all proportion.

To return to the evidence of God's economy in leading the Hebrew people on to a clearer idea of the future life, it is only as they grew, under His discipline, into richer spiritual

[1] *I came that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly* (John x. 10).
The last ENEMY that shall be destroyed is DEATH (1 Cor. xv. 26).

> For who, to dumb forgetfulness a prey,
> This pleasing anxious being e'er resigned;
> Left the warm precincts of the cheerful day,
> Nor cast one longing lingering look behind?
> GRAY'S *Elegy*.

> Whatever crazy sorrow saith,
> No life that breathes with human breath
> Hath ever truly longed for death.
>
> 'Tis life, whereof our nerves are scant,
> Oh life, not death, for which we pant:
> More life, and fuller, that I want.
> TENNYSON'S *Two Voices*.

experience of what God meant to the individual soul in this life that they could wholesomely dwell on their relationship to Him and to one another in the other life beyond the grave. We see the glimmerings of this growing consciousness in poets and seers first of all before it spreads among the people. There is evidence that it never became universal. Up to the destruction of the Temple there was a small but highly placed and influential minority which clung to the primitive agnosticism and rejected the fuller light.[1]

The Book of Job and the Psalms have many indications that the dawn was breaking, though fitfully, and with many cloudings over. It was long before the full consequences of Job's sublime outburst of faith and hope were realised. He himself does not always maintain the same elevation of thought and feeling as in xix. 25–7: *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand up at the latter day upon the earth: And after my skin hath been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God: Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another.*[2]

If we read chapter xiv. we cannot help seeing how strongly it contrasts with the confident tone of the passage just quoted. But in his utmost despondency about man's future, Job does not deny that he survives death. He is profoundly impressed with the sadness of the irrevocable nature of death. The joy of life, the glory and beauty of the world go on, but the dead are utterly cut off from it. He stands spellbound before that bitter fact: *Man dieth and wasteth away: Yea, man giveth up the ghost and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the river decayeth and*

[1] The Sadducees, for example, "*which say that there is no resurrection*" (Matt. xxii. 23; cf. Acts xxiii. 8). The opinion is ventured that the Sadducees refused to go beyond the old conception of a gloomy Sheol into which men went at death. The more advanced thinkers who had reached by that time a conception of a resurrection, and even a resurrection of the body, treated these reactionary conservatives as denying a survival of the soul in any true sense.

[2] This is the Revisers' version in the text. There are difficulties and obscurities in the Hebrew. The LXX pre-christian translation is as in our Prayer Books. But in spite of the confusion in the Hebrew, Dr. Charles sums up thus: "The Book of Job exhibits the steps whereby the human spirit rose to the apprehension of a blessed life beyond the grave," *Eschatology*, p. 71.

drieth up ; so man lieth down and riseth not : Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be roused out of their sleep (xiv. 10–12). What he is denying is that man rises again to this life. He neither denies nor affirms the resurrection as later Hebrews conceived it, for it had not entered into his thought of the future life. Nor does he deny the existence of souls in Sheol after death, for in the next verse he bursts out into a cry for its shelter : *Oh that Thou wouldest hide me in Sheol, that Thou wouldest keep me secret until Thy wrath be past* (*v.* 13).

In a later chapter Job seems to catch a gleam of consolation about the condition of the soul in Sheol : *If He set His heart upon man, if He gather unto Himself his* [*i.e.* man's] *spirit and his breath.* The poet uses the familiar word for "gather unto his people," but changes it significantly into gather man's spirit "unto Himself." If that be so (the argument seems to run), it does not really matter if *All flesh shall perish together, And man shall turn again unto dust* (xxxiv. 14).

Passing over Psalm xxxi. 5, *Into Thy hand I commend my spirit,* Psalm civ. 29–30, and similar passages, which imply a life after death, we come to Psalm xvi. 9–11. This seems to breathe a hope of a happy future life, but the inference is questioned by some, with whom it does not appear to weigh that S. Peter quoted it in this sense on the Day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 25–7), and similarly S. Paul at a later date (Acts xiii. 35). Here are the words : *Therefore my heart is glad and my glory* [*i.e.* my soul] *rejoiceth : My flesh also shall dwell in safety. For Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol ; Neither wilt Thou suffer Thine holy one to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life : In Thy presence is fulness of joy ; in Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.*

In like manner Psalm xvii. 15 seems to refer to the future life : *As for me, I shall behold Thy face in righteousness ; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness.* But in both cases the reference to the future life is not absolutely beyond all cavil. It is capable of being explained away. And we must be on our guard against straining the evidence by a hair's-breadth. The Christian devotional use of these

words to express a fuller doctrine than their authors could have meant or understood at the time of writing must not be allowed to influence our judgment as to their original meaning.

With Psalms xlix. 15 and lxxiii. 24 we are on surer ground, even in the judgment of the most sceptical of the critics.

In xlix. 15 there is an expression of confidence on the part of the Psalmist that God will protect him in Sheol and deliver him from it. The preceding verse describes the unhappy condition of the wicked in the unseen world: *They are appointed as a flock for Sheol; Death shall be their shepherd: And the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning; And their beauty shall be for Sheol to consume, that there be no habitation for it.* Then the Psalmist utters his own imperishable hope: *But God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol: For He shall receive* [1] *me.*

Psalm lxxiii. 24 reads: *Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, And afterwards receive me to glory.*

But it is in the prophets proper that the resurrection hope reaches its highest expression. Isaiah xxvi. 19 has this assured declaration: *Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth the dead.* The resurrection of the body is at length expressly confessed. Israel reaches a point which the Egyptians had attained centuries before, and which Babylonia had dimly apprehended in the resurrection myth of Tammuz. It may be, of course, that the prophet is only speaking of the resurrection of his own people. But he does not expressly restrict it to them.

Daniel xii. 2, 3 declares the joyful resurrection of the righteous and the sad experience then of the wicked, but does not expressly set forth the body's share in either hap: *And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the*

[1] The Psalmist is probably influenced by the Enoch tradition (Gen. v. 24), where the same Hebrew word is used for "God *took* him," as for "*receive* me" in the Psalm.

brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.

NOTE.—No direct notice has been taken of the Higher Criticism so far, mainly because the foregoing conclusions are hardly affected by it. But lest these conclusions should be thought to have been reached in a state of unawareness of "Higher" activities, it will be necessary to define the writer's position in the matter.

Much valuable work has been done by scholars both in Germany and in England, and much still remains to be done. Every well-established fact which they have brought to light is to be gratefully accepted. But what those facts are remains in many cases extremely doubtful, while the critics differ among themselves so widely as they do. Still, it is safe to accept points on which they universally agree, such as the composite nature of the Pentateuch, and a few other outstanding contentions. But the discriminating student, after giving adequate and careful study to all that has been written on the subject, must form his own conclusions as to what has been really established "beyond a peradventure," and what remains mere conjecture and hypothesis.

Nor is the independent student's work done when he has satisfied himself that such and such are indisputable facts. He may be more competent to judge of the bearing of those facts on the general scheme of Biblical science than the men who are engaged in quite a subordinate, though an important, field of investigation.

An illustration from another department of human activity may help us here. The relation of laboratory work and of the dissecting room to the study of humanity is not unlike that which subsists between the work of the Higher Critics and Biblical theology and exegesis. It would not be easy to exaggerate the importance of the anatomist's and the chemist's work in adding to our knowledge and understanding of the human frame. But there are obvious limitations to the scope of the knowledge gained in the dissecting room and laboratory. Before the skeleton and tissue come under the scalpel and microscope, or reach the retort or test-tube, *life has fled*. There is nothing to differentiate the poet, the orator, the statesman, the military genius, the historian, the novelist, the devout lover of God and man, from persons of quite different qualities of mind and soul. It has been said that the anatomist and chemist find no trace of soul as they pursue their study of the human body. Why, of course

not. Neither do their most delicate instruments reveal a trace of mind, for the very good reason that both soul and mind are gone before the receptacles of soul and mind can come under their scrutiny.

The most intimate knowledge of the human anatomy does not confer aptitude for the affairs of life. It is not by that avenue that a man reaches skill in dealing with living men and women in the drawing-room, the mill, the shop, or the cabinet. It is no disparagement of the anatomist or the chemist to say so. No more is it an undervaluing of the "Higher Critic" in his own proper sphere, that we do not accept him on that account as an authority on Biblical or other theology. He, too, deals with the casket after the treasure is gone. He can tell us much that is most valuable and interesting of the structure, of the date, and of the various layers that go to form the casket in its present form; but his investigation of its anatomy does not give him any special skill in regard to the living contents of the casket. Before he can dissect the wonderful Book he has to decide to treat it as a corpse capable of dissection. It is not at all unreasonable to regard the methods of the dissecting room as even disqualifying a man for appreciating the living thing which he has been treating as a corpse. Dissection of the framework of the Bible with the utmost skill does not necessarily fit a man to pronounce upon its living force and meaning. Of course he may possess other qualifications which justify him in claiming to be an expert in exegesis, but these must be in addition to his skill and experience in dissection.

What is wanted is not less but more of Higher Criticism, more thorough, better informed all round, more devoted to truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. If some critics have thrown away the key which fits all locks, viz. the Incarnation, some of their devoted work may still yield valuable information. Their theories in explanation of the facts will necessarily suffer by leaving out the master fact. It is unfortunate that some English followers of the Wellhausen School of critics have forgotten this, swallowed theories as well as facts, and given a bad impression of this modern development of Biblical Science.

B. *The Apocrypha.*—The books of the secondary Canon carry on and enlarge the disclosures of Isaiah and Daniel regarding the future life. We shall touch briefly on their witness to the belief of the Jewish Church of their own age, following the order of Article of Religion VI.

The Third Book of Esdras is entirely occupied with the affairs of this world, and deals with religious matters only in their external aspect. It contains no explicit reference one way or the other to the next world.[1] This is amply made up for by *The Fourth Book of Esdras*,[2] but in view of the fact that many scholars assign the book in its present form to the first century after Christ, it cannot be quoted with confidence to show what was the Jewish conception of the future life before the Christian era. If that late date be finally accepted, the remarkable teaching on the Resurrection would be contemporary with the New Testament. The present writer does not accept the dates given by the German critics, and too slavishly followed by some English scholars. But as the guiding principle of this treatise is to put forward no argument which can be questioned with any show of reason, it becomes necessary to warn the reader that *The Fourth Book of Esdras* may not be a pre-Christian compilation. Subject, then, to the caution that the date of the book is still disputed among scholars, the following extract from it will be found interesting :—

For behold the days come, and it shall be when the signs which I have foretold unto thee shall come to pass, And whosoever is delivered from the predicted evils, the same shall see My wonders. For My Son the Messiah shall be revealed, together with those who are with Him, and shall rejoice the survivors four hundred years. And it shall be, after these years, that My Son the Messiah shall die, and all in whom there is human breath. Then shall the world be turned into primæval silence seven days, like as at the first beginnings ; so that no man is left. And it shall be after seven days that the Age which is not yet awake shall be roused, and that which is corruptible shall perish. And the earth shall restore those that sleep in her, and the dust of those that are at rest therein, and the chambers [*i.e.* of Sheol] shall

[1] For a good provisional summary to the many questions raised in connection with this book, see Mr. S. A. Cook's Introduction in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. i. pp. 1–20.

[2] Canon Box's Introduction and notes to this book, in *Apoc. and Pseudep. of O.T.* vol. ii. pp. 542–624, will be found to contain the essential facts relating to its history and contents. His conclusions are generally sound as well as scholarly. The question of the dates of the final compilation and of the documents included in it must be regarded as still unsettled.

restore those that were committed unto them. . . . And then shall the pit of torment appear, and over against it the place of refreshment; the furnace of Gehenna shall be made manifest, and over against it the Paradise of delight. And then shall the Most High say to the nations that have been raised from the dead.[1] . . . (vii. 26–32, 36–7).

The Book of Tobias is a much earlier work. Its latest editor, Mr. D. C. Simpson, in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, vol. i. p. 185, gives about 350 B.C. as the earliest, and about 170 B.C. as the latest date for its composition.

The story is a romance, and only incidentally concerned with theological matters. However, various references to the future life are imbedded in the narrative here and there. In a prayer Tobit asks God to "command that I be now released from my distress and may go to the Everlasting Place" (iii. 6); Sarah speaks of "bringing down her father's old age with sorrow to Hades" (iii. 10); in another prayer Tobit says: "He [*i.e.* God] leadeth down to Hades, and bringeth up again" (xiii. 2). But nothing is said which throws light on the author's ideas about life in that unseen world.

The Book of Judith, which, some time before the Christian era,[2] was translated into Greek from the Hebrew original (now no longer extant), is also a religious romance written for purposes of edification. There is only a single clear reference to the future life, if we omit such phrases as "her husband died and was gathered to his people" (xvi. 22). In chapter xvi. 17 we have this "woe" pronounced on the nations which persecuted the Jews:—

> Woe to the nations that rise up against my race: The Lord Almighty will take vengeance of them in the day of judgment, to put fire and worms in their flesh; And they shall weep and feel their pain for ever.

Here the wicked are pictured as clothed in their "flesh" at and after the Day of Judgment. The righteous can hardly have been imagined to be in different case.

[1] Canon Box's translation. The A.V. and R.V. are more idiomatic, but represent a less carefully tested text.

[2] So Dr. Cowley dates it. See *Apoc. and Pseudep.* vol. i. p. 245.

The Rest of the Book of Esther is dated by Dr. Gregg (*Apoc. and Pseudep.* vol. i. p. 669) after 125 B.C., and possibly much later. In xiii. 7 of R.V. Artaxerxes is represented as ending his letter with the words :—

. . . that they who in days past and even now are malicious may in one day go down violently into Hades, and may henceforth leave our State secure and unthreatened.

The Book of Wisdom is assigned to various dates B.C. by recent editors. Mr. S. Holmes, who edits *Wisdom* in *Apoc. and Pseudep.*, is inclined to a date 50 to 30 B.C. for the first twelve chapters, and 30 B.C. to 10 A.D. for the rest.

The noble passage on the future life (iii. 1–9) of the righteous is transcribed in full :—

But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God,
And no torment shall touch them.
In the eyes of foolish men they seemed to have died ;
And their departure was accounted to be their hurt,
And their journeying away from us to be their ruin.
But they are in peace.
Their hope is full of immortality ;
And having borne a little chastening, they shall receive great good,
Because God made trial of them and found them worthy of Himself.
As gold in the furnace He proved them,
And as a whole burnt-offering he accepted them.
And in the time of their visitation they shall shine forth,
And as sparks among stubble they shall run to and fro.
They shall judge nations, and have dominion over peoples ;
And the Lord shall reign over them for evermore.[1]

Jesus the Son of Sirach, commonly called *Ecclesiasticus*, is generally accepted by modern scholars as an earlier work than *Wisdom*. The date given[2] by Canon Box and Dr. Oesterley, after a very careful discussion, is about 180–175 B.C. for the original Hebrew,[3] and 132–116 B.C. for the Greek translation by the author's grandson.

[1] See Appendix A., p. 275, n. 2, for some further remarks on *Wisdom*. For other references to the unseen world see i. 14, ii. 1, xvi. 13, and xvii. 14.

[2] *Apoc. and Pseudep.* vol. i. p. 293.

[3] For the interesting story of the recent recovery of large parts of the Hebrew, see Schechter, *The Wisdom of Ben-Sira*.

There is very little said about the future life in this book, though it is profoundly religious in tone throughout. The sense of this life as the sphere of true religion is strong :—

For what pleasure hath God in all that perish in Hades, in place of those who live and give Him praise? Thanksgiving perisheth from the dead as from one that is not, but he that liveth and is in health praiseth the Lord.[1]

The life in the unseen world is acknowledged. It does not interest the writer, with his vivid sense of the present life and its obligations, its joys and privileges. The standpoint is that of Hezekiah [2]—the same naive shrinking from death, and the same gloomy picture of life in Sheol. But a more attractive view is not altogether wanting. We have, for instance, "Weep gently for the dead, for he is at rest" (xxii. 11); "When the dead is at rest, let his memory rest, and be consoled when he departeth" (xxxviii. 23).

Baruch the Prophet adds nothing on our subject beyond the familiar moan over the life in Sheol (ii. 17).[3] Similarly the *Song of the Three Children* speaks with a dread of Sheol (v. 66), but the invocation of the "spirits and souls of the righteous" in verse 64, which most naturally would appear to refer to the dead,[4] as would also the invocation of Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, bears witness to their knowledge of and interest in the fortunes of the living.

The short pieces, the *Story of Susanna*, of *Bel and the Dragon*, and *The Prayer of Manasses*, have little occasion to refer to the other world.

The First Book of Maccabees (about 125 B.C.) is remarkable in that it never once mentions God by any of His usual titles,[5] nor refers to the future life. It is concerned only with certain events in the history of the Jews, which it relates in the most matter-of-fact fashion.

[1] Cf. Ps. cxvi. 3 for a similarly despondent view of the future life. The "unseen world" is mentioned also, ix. 12, xiv. 12, 16, xxi. 10, xxviii. 21, xli. 4, xlviii. 5, li. 5, 6.

[2] Isa. xxxviii. 18, 19.

[3] Cf. also iii. 11, 19.

[4] Dr. Charles, however, thinks it refers to the living, *Apoc. and Pseudep.* vol. i. p. 636.

[5] iv. 30 has the title, "Saviour of Israel," however.

On the other hand, *The Second Book of Maccabees* (about 100 B.C.) is most clear and definite in teaching the resurrection of the dead. The resurrection is proclaimed by the second of the seven martyrs :—

When he was at the last gasp, he said, Thou, miscreant, dost release us out of this present Life, but the King of the world shall raise up us, who have died for His laws, unto an eternal renewal of life (vii. 9).

The third went further and made a confession of the resurrection of the body. Stretching forth his tongue and hands to be cut off, he exclaims :—

These I received from heaven, and for His laws' sake I contemn them ; and from Him I hope to receive them back again [1] (vii. 11).

The fourth taunts the torturer, because for the latter there will be " no resurrection unto life," *i.e.* if he rises again, it will be a resurrection unto death (vii. 14). The heroic mother, who had calmly seen six sons put to death with the utmost barbarity, encouraged her remaining son to stand steadfast like his brothers, and gives utterance to the resurrection hope :—

. . . The Creator of the World, who fashioned the generation of man and devised the generation of all things, in mercy giveth back to you again both your spirit and your life. . . . Fear not this butcher, but proving thyself worthy of thy brethren, accept thy death, that in the mercy of God I may receive thee again with thy brethren (vii. 23, 29).

And finally we have in chapter xii. 43–5 the first recorded instance in Jewish history of prayers and offerings for the dead. The people had now become purged of any danger of falling into Polytheism and other superstitions, which had been connected with similar pious practices in Egypt and Babylonia. The historian of *Second Maccabees* comments on the incident in these terms : " For if he had not been expecting that they that had fallen would rise again, it were superfluous and idle to pray for the dead " (xii. 44).

[1] Cf. a similar expression of the martyred Razis (xiv. 46).

As a matter of fact, the Jews in all their chequered history since then (about 160 B.C.) have never fallen into idolatry, as they had done before repeatedly, and have never ceased to offer intercession for their dead.

. . . . .

N.B.—The foregoing dates of the Books of the Apocrypha are taken from the monumental work, so often quoted, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.* But the present writer must record his conviction that the tendency of the General Editor and some of his collaborators is to bring down some of the dates unduly.

This is not said for the purpose of disparaging the inestimable services that Dr. Charles has done to the English-speaking peoples in popularising study of the literature which flourished in Jewish circles before and at the Christian era. These books had been largely neglected by our scholars. The glory of a pioneer belongs to him, but also the drawbacks. A pioneer's work generally needs sifting by the next generation. That sifting process is now due, and our younger scholars are engaged on it.

The importance of fresh or forgotten material is apt to be exaggerated when it is first brought forward. Those who are old enough to remember the excitement over the re-discovery of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, and the extravagant claims that were made for it by some of its first editors, will understand that the modest position into which that work settled down, when scholars had time to examine it thoroughly, is not unlikely to be the fate of the Eschatological literature, of which so much was made a few years ago, and which is already finding its proper level. It will always form a considerable item among the subsidiary documents, which students of the New Testament must take into account.

C. *Pseudepigrapha.*—Why some of the more important of the Eschatological writings, from which we are about to quote, were never admitted even into the secondary rank of the Canon by either Jew or Christian must remain a subject of speculation. Some were prior in date to some of the books of the Apocrypha. Some are superior in literary value. Some breathe a lofty piety—compared, for example, with the *First Book of Maccabees*, or the *Third Book of*

Esdras. Why was 2 Baruch excluded from and 1 Baruch admitted to the second rank ?

Part of the explanation may be found in the extravagance of these Apocalyptic books, which appealed to a certain type of mind, but not to the highest. There was evidently a public which read them, or they would hardly have continued to be written. But that public would seem to have been found among sectaries, and the more backward classes of the Jewish people. The sect of the Zadokites, which flourished just before the opening of the Christian era, accepted the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* as authoritative.[1] That these religio-historic romances were intended to deceive or did, as a matter of fact, deceive their readers as to their authorship and date is most unlikely. Perhaps we have a modern parallel to it in the popularity of *The Prince of the House of David* and such romances in certain circles a generation ago. These latter were definitely for edification, and did not expect to be taken as serious histories. Or is a truer parallel to the vogue of the Apocalyptic literature to be found in the writings of Dr. Cummings ? In the middle of last century his prophecies as to the exact date of the end of the world found acceptance among people of limited culture and intelligence. Pretenders of a like kind have appeared at various times and are by no means extinct.[2]

Whether we have modern parallels or not, the fact remains that these Apocalyptic books, which according to a convention of their time were written in the name of Jewish Saints or heroes of old, were not admitted into either the Jewish or Christian Canon, and were not taken seriously by either Jewish or Christian writers of authority. The only purpose in quoting from certain of them here is to show that the doctrine of the resurrection, which at first was the vision and hope of the poet and the prophet, had permeated to the lower strata of the Jewish people before the Advent.

[1] According to Dr. Charles, *Apoc. and Pseudep.* vol. ii. p. 796.

[2] Our Lord has warned us of this, Matt. xxiv. 26–7 ; cf. also Mark xiii. 32 ; Acts i. 7 ; 1 Thess. v. 1–4 ; 2 Thess. ii. 2.

Dr. Charles, in his Introduction, finds the resurrection clearly expressed in 1 Enoch :—

This doctrine, which is first taught beyond possibility of doubt in Dan. xii., though a true exegesis will find many intimations of the doctrine in earlier books, was made a commonplace of Jewish theology by 1 Enoch.[1]

Compare 1 Enoch c. 5 : And over all the righteous and holy He will appoint guardians from amongst the Angels to guard them as the apple of an eye, until He makes an end of wickedness and sin ; and though the righteous sleep a long sleep, they have nought to fear.[2]

The righteous shall arise from their sleep and wisdom shall arise and be given unto them [3] (1 Enoch xci. 10).

The Book of Jubilees, which is attributed by Dr. Charles to 153–105 B.C., bears this testimony :—

And at that time the Lord will heal His servants, and they shall rise up and see great peace and drive out their adversaries. And the righteous shall see and be thankful and rejoice with joy for ever and ever and shall see all their curses and judgments on their enemies. And their bones shall rest in the earth and their spirits shall have much joy.[4] . . . (xxiii. 30–1).

Dr. Charles assigns the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* to the years 109–106 B.C. Three brief citations from words put in the mouths of the Patriarchs will suffice :—

The Testament of Benjamin, x. 6–8 : And then shall ye see Enoch, Noah, Shem, and Abraham and Isaac and Jacob rising on the right hand in gladness. Then shall we also rise, each over his own tribe [*i.e.* the twelve tribes], and we shall worship the Heavenly King. Then shall we all be changed, some unto glory and some unto shame ; for the Lord judges Israel first for the unrighteousness which they have committed. And then also shall He judge the Gentiles.[5]

The Testament of Judah, iv. : And they that have died in grief shall arise in joy, and they who are put to death for the Lord's

[1] *Apoc. and Pseudep.* vol. ii. p. 185.
[2] *Ib.* p. 272.
[3] *Ib.* p. 262.
[4] *Ib.* p. 49.
[5] *Ib.* p. 359.

sake shall awake to life . . . and all the people shall glorify the Lord for ever.[1]

The Testament of Zebulun, x. 1, 2: And now, my children, grieve not that I am dying, nor be cast down that I am coming to my end. For I shall rise again in the midst of you, as a ruler in the midst of his sons.[2]

[1] *Apoc. and Pseudep.* vol. ii. p. 324. [2] *Ib.* p. 332.

CHAPTER III

THE DOCTRINE FULLY DISCLOSED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE truth, which man had been feeling after from his earliest times of self-realisation, and which very slowly dawned on the consciousness of the Old Testament Saints, is fully disclosed in the New Testament. If the reader will turn to Appendix E, 5, 6 and 7, he will find a catena of the texts, which set forth in express terms the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ and the promised resurrection of His people. It is a very impressive collection of passages.

To discuss them in detail is superfluous. Only one comment will be made. The reader is asked to notice that in the passages from Acts iii. 15 onwards, all through the Epistles, almost without exception, the Resurrection of our Lord Himself, and that of Christians, which is yet to take place, is ascribed to the direct act of God, or of Christ acting in the plenitude of His Divine Nature. This marks in a very striking manner the greatness of the transaction. It is something more than a mere natural sequence. On the one hand the resurrection of the body is led up to by the body's preceding history, on the other it requires a fresh exercise of the power of God to bring the promise to fulfilment. *This Jesus hath* GOD *raised up* (Acts ii. 32); *GOD hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us through His power* (1 Cor. vi. 14).

Leaving, then, the direct statements concerning the resurrection in their simple majesty, we will proceed to place before the reader some features of New Testament teaching which supply a fitting atmosphere for the doctrine.

Thrice S. Paul speaks of Christians as being temples—

sanctuaries, shrines—of God or of the Holy Ghost. Twice in general terms: *Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are* (1 Cor. iii. 16–17). *For we are a temple of the living God . . .* (2 Cor. vi. 16). And more specifically this shrine is identified with the body: *Every sin that a man doeth is without the body. . . . Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost—which—is—in—you, which ye have from God? And ye are not your own, for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body* (1 Cor. vi. 18–20).

Would it be possible to place the body on a higher pinnacle of dignity? Can, then, this vehicle and companion of the soul, this, which in the Apostle's language is treated as interchangeable with the personality, which is indwelt by the Holy Spirit as a shrine, can it be merely a temporary and passing affair? The Holy Spirit is not concerned with the soul alone, as some would have us believe. He indwells man's whole being, body as well as soul, according to the teaching of S. Paul.

In a third passage, the exceeding dignity of the Christian body is expressed in another way. The Apostle asks: *Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?* (1 Cor. vi. 15). This question follows on a statement of the mutual relationship between Christ and the Christian's body: *The body is . . . for the Lord, and the Lord for the body* (*v.* 13), not alone for the soul. When in Ephesians v. 23 our Lord is spoken of as "being Himself the Saviour of the Body," it is the mystical Body, the Church, that is intended in the first instance; but in 1 Cor. vi. 13 the context shows clearly that it is the human body that is "for the Lord," and the Lord for it. It is to be an instrument for His service: He supplies all its needs. He takes it into union with Himself, and that union is for eternity, for *God both raised up the Lord, and will raise up us through His power* (*v.* 14).

The same passage draws a very clear distinction between the body's perishable elements and the essential, abiding

thing—the body itself: *Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall bring to nought both it and them* (*v.* 13). The Apostle in the same breath asserts the resurrection of the Lord and of us. This apparent contradiction—the bringing to nought of the bodily organisation, and God's raising the body up—should have received far more attention than it has done. It would seem difficult to distinguish more clearly between the body proper and such organs of the body as serve the temporary purposes of the present life. An outstanding example of the temporary and passing elements is given—food and the organs adapted to its assimilation. These, in the present condition, belong to the present environment, and come to an end with it. But the body itself, brought into relation with the Lord of the body, will be raised up under a new and imperishable form suited to the heavenly life and surroundings. S. Paul's argument turns on the continuance of the body in its essential integrity. Because of this, argues the Apostle, the body must be regarded with honour and must not be associated with anything which is mean or degrading. *Shall I, then,* asks the Apostle indignantly, *take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot?* (*v.* 15).

The body, then, in its essence—in its *substance* as the Latins from Tertullian onwards speak of it—survives the wreck of its earthly organisation, in like manner as it preserves its identity through all the crises of its ante-natal life. Similarly amid the constant flux of the material particles, which it is constantly taking up and associating with its life, and as constantly laying down again when they have served its turn, the body's identity does not depend on the identity of these everchanging elements.

S. Paul does not enter into the further question, of what does the permanent body consist? Is its basis material? In view of S. Paul's silence, any answer given can only be tentative in our present state of knowledge. But modern science, which is almost breaking down the middle wall of partition between matter and spirit, may suggest that it is possibly one of those subtler forms of matter—atoms, electrons—which elude the apprehension of our present

senses. If man were to be permanently disengaged from matter of some sort, he would become a new thing altogether. "The redemption of our body," that adoption for which the Apostle represents us as waiting (Rom. viii. 23), would have failed to come about. Death would have triumphed, if the two things which it had sundered are never to come together again. Man consists of body and soul. Soul only could never be more than a part of the complete man.

But if S. Paul does not give a definition of the substance which constitutes the imperishable body as distinguished from the mortal and continually changing body, he does give an illustration of the process whereby the abiding basis of the body disengages itself from its temporary associates and still remains itself all through the disenthralment. He points to the familiar evolution of the seed into the plant. The seed, seemingly dead, only awaits the appropriate conditions of soil, warmth, and moisture to disentangle itself from its wrappings and to produce something utterly unlike the dull thing from which it springs. The wrappings fall away and perish when they have fulfilled their office. The life-principle alone endures.

The Apostle's argument (1 Cor. xv. 35–38) assumes that the life-principle of the human body does not perish when the body is parted from the soul. The whole point of the illustration is missed when the reader overlooks the fact that it is the body of a dead person that is compared to a seed. The question was: *How are the dead raised and with what manner of body do they come?* The body had been separated from the soul at death. That body had been sown a natural body, but it is to be raised a spiritual body. S. Paul illustrates this transformation by the familiar example of what happens to a seed that is sown in the earth. The dull, seemingly dead thing produces a plant, a thing as unlike itself as can be. There was evidently something in the seed capable of effecting this wonderful evolution. Similarly—the argument assumes—the natural body contains within it something corresponding to the life-germ of the seed, a something which will eventually become the spiritual body. In both

cases the sheltering material wrappings fall away, but the hidden life persists.

All this is lost if we make the hidden life-force of the seed correspond to the soul. For the soul is not sown in or with the body. If the Apostle were speaking of a living human being, and were to compare him to a seed, then the soul would naturally correspond to the life-germ and the body would then answer to the material envelope. But the Apostle is speaking not of living persons but of the resurrection of the dead and of the bodies in which they are to come, and of the connection between the body, which the soul had left, and the body into which it is to return. It is this connection that he illustrates by the parable of the seed. The seed and the body are both sown, as it were. Both are dull, inert, devoid of signs of life. From both spring something far surpassing themselves in form, in living grace and beauty. The soul in the meantime is undergoing a preparation of its own, which will fit it in due time to renew its association with its refashioned body. So, having once more become a complete human being, the reunited soul and body enter on a joint life under new circumstances, for which they have been adapted in their time of separation. The soul does not return to another body, with which it had no connection before, but to its own proper body. To each individual seed its own proper body is given (1 Cor. xv. 38).

It is no less important to notice the limits of the illustration than it is to observe what the two things are between which the comparison lies. S. Paul confines himself to the contrast between the seed and the plant which springs from it, as showing the striking difference between the natural body and that spiritual body which it becomes at the resurrection. He does not extend his analogy to the fruitfulness of the plant and its eventual extinction. It is the former of these two further points in the life-history of a seed that our Lord makes use of in S. John xii. 24: *Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit.* Dying to one's own selfish interests is a pre-requisite to spiritual

fruitfulness, as the seed must first die before its capacity for bearing fruit can show itself.

The two illustrations draw their appropriateness from quite different points in the evolution of a seed. Neither takes account of the death of the fruitful plant when it has done its work, nor of the singularly apt analogy between the record of its past life which is impressed on the minute life-principle of the seed, and the similar capacity for registering the former life possessed by the vital "substance" of the human body—if one may use the technical Latin word for the persistent something which preserves the identity of the body all through life and death. The plant bears clear evidence of the good or bad experiences of the seed from which it grows. So spiritual bodies are to differ from one another in glory according to the goodness or badness or indifference of the life lived in the natural body.

S. Paul does not say how or where the essential substance of the body awaits the appropriate conditions for springing into obvious life again. It awaits the voice and the trumpet. But in due time it is to assume that changed form which is fit to enshrine the purified soul and to share in the glories and activities of the spiritual world. Nor does he say what relationship, if any, it bears, in the waiting time, to the discarded material particles which happened to be associated with it at the moment of dissolution. But he gives no reason for believing that the last supply of material particles is more intimately bound up with its fortunes than the vast quantity of similar particles that had preceded them. All of them return to the earth from which they were taken. Raised for a time to a position of dignity they are all ultimately dethroned.

The idea is not uncommon that the dust itself is spoken of in Scripture and in Church teaching as rising again. The only places in Scripture where dust is mentioned in connection with resurrection is Isa. xxvi. 19, and Dan. xii. 2: "*Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust*"; "*Many of them that sleep in the dust shall awake*" (xii. 2). It is they that sleep, not the dust in which they sleep, that is to awake.

Nowhere in Scripture is the dust itself said to share in the resurrection.

S. Paul's plain statement towards the end of the same chapter confirms the transformation that awaits the life-principle of the body at the resurrection. *Flesh and blood*, he says, *shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven; i.e.* "flesh and blood" as they now exist. That life-principle, that basis of the body, which is to be transformed into the glorified body, is so identical with the body that it can be spoken of by that term without qualification: *The Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the Body of His glory* (Phil. iii. 21). S. Paul in another place disregards all possibilities of misunderstanding and identifies that which is to be raised again with the "mortal body" itself: *But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in you* (Rom. viii. 11).

The New Testament throughout assumes that if the essential basis of a substance be preserved when it assumes a new form, we are warranted in calling it the same, however great may be the change which its form may have undergone.

Three other analogies, which are used in the New Testament to denote the resurrection, deserve some notice.

(*a*) The rest after death is frequently described as a sleep, and sleep implies an awakening. S. Stephen *fell asleep* (Acts vii. 60); *We shall not all sleep* (1 Cor. xv. 51); *them that are fallen asleep in Jesus* (1 Thess. iv. 14). But the awakening from the sleep of death is not used exclusively of resurrection; it is used of temporary reanimation,[1] which is something quite different. *Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep*, said our Lord; *but I go that I may awake him out of sleep* (John xi. 11). This awakening, as in the case of Jairus' daughter and the widow's son, meant no more than a return for a time to the conditions of earthly life, and then a falling asleep again. It involved no structural change in

[1] See Appendix E, 1, pp. 309–10.

the resuscitated body. The body remained subject to the laws and limitations of life on earth—in a word, remained a natural body. It had not become a spiritual body, free from corruption, dishonour and weakness (1 Cor. xv. 42–4). But " them that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him," that is, with their Saviour, when He comes. Together with them " that are alive," shall they be caught up in the clouds and shall ever be with the Lord (1 Thess. iv. 14–17).

(*b*) Baptism is another analogy, prophetic of the resurrection of the body. In the first instance, it is to a new moral and spiritual life in this world that we are raised by Baptism. *We were buried with Him through Baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with Him by the likeness of His Death, we shall be also by the likeness of His Resurrection* (Rom. vi. 4–5). *In Whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with Him in Baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead* (Col. ii. 11, 12).

The act of Baptism points to a change of sphere, in which the new life is to be lived in " the power of His Resurrection " (Phil. iii. 10). It introduces us into a new status, imposes new responsibilities, and promises new powers for their discharge. The typical action of Baptism sets forth these changed conditions. We are raised up from the grave of water into the air and set our feet on the solid earth, which is, for the time, to be the scene of this new life. There is no change of bodily structure, but in our new status as members of Christ we have access to the other great Sacrament, which carries the moral and spiritual resurrection a step further: *He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.*

(*c*) S. Paul presents us with another analogy of the resurrection of the body. He compares it with the birth

process. Christ is "*the firstborn*[1] *from the dead*" (Col. i. 18). Birth brings the child into new conditions, for which it has been carefully prepared. The antecedent process has been complex, but the child retains its identity unimpaired through them all, and enters on its new life still the same.

Others had been raised from the dead only to die again. Christ is the "firstborn from the dead" by a different kind of resurrection[2]: *Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death no more hath dominion over Him* (Rom. vi. 9); *I was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore* (Rev. i. 18). That is the vital difference between reanimation and resurrection. Hitherto One and One only has passed through the experience of resurrection proper, but He is the first of a series. In due time He will give others to taste of that experience.

These analogies do not go beyond illustrating one of the necessary elements of "the resurrection of the flesh" as professed in the Apostles' Creed, viz. the identity of the body in its former and its latter state.

(*d*) The other element of the doctrine is the transfiguration which the body undergoes in the process of development. This second point has its own illustrations. The resurrection of the moral nature of men here has points of resemblance to the resurrection of the body hereafter. The first of these two resurrections is thus described by S. Paul: *God, being rich in mercy for His great love wherewith He loved us even when we were dead through our trespasses, hath quickened us together with Christ* (*by grace have ye been saved*), *and raised us up with Him, and made us to sit with Him in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus* (Eph. ii. 4–6). Our Lord, again, foreshows the two resurrections in almost identical words. He thus expresses the moral and spiritual resurrection: *Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour cometh and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live* (John v. 25); compare

[1] Cf. Rev. i. 5, where the same title is claimed by our Lord. In Heb. i. 6, He is the Firstborn in His Divine Nature. S. Paul uses the term in two other places of the Incarnate Lord: "the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. viii. 29); "the firstborn of all creation" (Col. i. 15).

[2] The "better resurrection" of Heb. xi. 35.

S. Paul's words: *And you did He quicken, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins* (Eph. ii. 1); *And you, being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you, I say, did He quicken together with Him* (Col. ii. 13).

The final resurrection is portrayed by our Lord in nearly the same terms: *The hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear His voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of Judgment* (John v. 28, 29).

There is nothing fanciful, therefore, in regarding the resurrection at the last day as finding its analogue in the moral and spiritual quickening of man's nature on earth. The analogy is borne out by these further considerations.

1. It is the same power of God which carries out both renewals. S. Paul declares the identity in Eph. i. 18–20: *. . . having the eyes of your heart enlightened, that ye may be able to understand what is the hope of His calling, what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe, according to that working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead.*

2. The indwelling of the Spirit, which brings about the transformation of man's moral nature, is the earnest, *i.e.* the foretaste in kind, of the resurrection which is to pass upon the body. S. Paul, rejoicing in the super-vesture of immortality which is put on over and "*swallows up what is mortal,*" exclaims: "*Now He that wrought us for this very thing is God, who gave unto us the earnest of the Spirit*" (2 Cor. v. 5).

The two essential constituents of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body are seen to be combined in this illustration. The moral and spiritual nature of man preserves its identity during and after the process of renewal. It is the same nature, but it has undergone a complete transformation. Similarly the body remains the same body in its essential integrity, but it is transmuted into unimaginable and transcendent glory and beauty at the resurrection.

In the course of man's moral renovation he lays aside certain grosser inclinations and propensities which are corruptions of essential qualities, and which can be eradicated and yet leave the essential qualities intact. The renewal is much more than a reversion to man's state of innocence. It is something much higher in the moral scale. The state of innocence consisted largely in ignorance of evil. The holiness inwrought by the Holy Spirit faces evil and triumphs over it.

In like manner the renewed human body far surpasses what it was in its primal state. It has become adapted to a far higher life. *For whom He foreknew He also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son* (Rom. viii. 29); *Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the Body of His glory* (Phil. iii. 21); *When Christ, Who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also be manifested with Him in glory* (Col. iii. 4); *Beloved, now are we the children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is* (1 John iii. 2).

* * * * * *

This is the climax of the New Testament teaching concerning the resurrection of the body. For any further elucidation of it we must await the event.

There are four subsidiary points, however, that will repay a brief consideration.

1. The word ordinarily used for "resurrection" [1] in the New Testament is applied only to our Lord's Resurrection and to the final resurrection of the dead, with one exception. The exception occurs in Heb. xi. 35: *Women received their dead by a resurrection* (*i.e.* by their temporary return to ordinary life): *and others were tortured, not accepting their deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection.* The contrast between reanimation and the better resurrection is very effective.[2]

[1] The verb from which the noun is formed has the common meaning of a change of posture, in addition to the higher meaning of "to raise again," "to rise again from the dead."

[2] See Appendix E for a full discussion of word "Resurrection."

2. There is very little said in the New Testament about the resurrection of the wicked: just enough to deter from such a life and to persuade to repentance; nothing to satisfy curiosity. Very probably we should be unable to understand, if any attempt were made to be more explicit. That they will rise again with their bodies is implied in the few cases where their resurrection is mentioned at all, John v. 29 being the principal instance of direct mention.

"Fear Him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell (Gehenna)" (Matt. x. 28) might by itself be taken to threaten eventual annihilation of the finally impenitent, but too little is revealed regarding their awful fate for any man to dogmatise on a subject on which our Lord and the Church have observed so great a reticence. The exact words of our Lord in S. Matthew confine themselves to asserting God's ability "to destroy both body and soul," which no one is likely to question. They do not say that He will exercise that dread power. S. Paul solely occupies himself with the fortunes in this life and the next of the righteous. He does not concern himself with speculations as to the precise fate of the unjust. Only once does he refer directly to the resurrection of the wicked. In Acts xxiv. 15 he says: *There shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust.*

3. Some are exercised because the Resurrection of our Lord differs in one respect from the promised resurrection in glory of the Just. His Body saw no corruption. The bodies of the greater part of mankind will have crumbled into dust long before the day of their resurrection. They think, therefore, that the parallel between His Resurrection and that of His people is not exact. Scripture and the Church do not dwell on the exactness of the parallel, but on the fact that His Resurrection is the source and pledge of ours, and that God is the prime agent in both cases.

There is a closer resemblance in point of detail between the rising again of our Lord and the resurrection of the quick, as described in 1 Thess. iv. 17, 1 Cor. xv. 52, and 2 Cor. v. 4. The bodies of those that are alive at the Coming will not see corruption. They will be "*changed*," "*what*

is mortal will be swallowed up of life," "*they will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air.*"

There is complete silence as to the manner of this instantaneous transformation. Precisely so does Scripture draw a veil over that supreme moment, when the Soul of our Divine Lord returned from Paradise and rejoined the transformed Body (or transformed it by rejoining it, we do not know)—that Body which had entered the tomb a natural body and emerged from it a Spiritual Body. We are allowed only to see the results of the transformation—grave clothes undisturbed, seals of the tomb unbroken, appearance and disappearance at will, recognition by intimate friends alternating with failure on their part to recognise, closed doors no barrier, and final visible withdrawal from even occasional ordinary sight.

4. A really important consideration, which is for the first time fully discussed in Appendices A, B, C, and D, is the pedigree of the word "flesh" as used in the New Testament. It can be said quite confidently that the history of that word's gradual disentanglement from its narrow and carnal Greek connotation until it could be used of our Lord's complete humanity, is one of the wonderful things in the age-long preparation for the Gospel.

The reader must refer to these Appendices for the whole story, but so much may be said here: the first chapters of the preparation of the word for its august destiny are laid in the Hebrew Bible. The word used for "flesh" there runs through a whole gamut of meanings from the "flesh" that is eaten for food to "flesh" as meaning "the whole man," body and soul, or the "whole humanity." The same word that is used for "flesh" in Gen. ix. 4: *But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat,* reached such a point of dignity that in Jer. xii. 12 it is equivalent to "man"—"*no flesh hath peace.*" In Isa. xlix. 26 we have both meanings in a single verse: "*But I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh . . . and all flesh* [*i.e.* all humanity] *shall know that I the Lord am thy Saviour. . . .*"

The intermediate stage came when the Hebrew Bible,

before the Advent, was translated into Greek, the language that in the fulness of time was to be the main vehicle to the world of the Gospel of Christ. The word chosen by the translators to express the Hebrew word that had come to mean the whole man, " complete humanity," was a Greek word that had never before been used in this high sense, but only in the sense of the visible, tangible, fleshly covering of the human body. The Greek word from this time on had in religious writings a new range of meaning, derived from the Hebrew word for which it stood in the Greek Old Testament.

The word, which had acquired a meaning entirely unknown in Pagan Greek authors, stood ready to the hand of the New Testament writers to express the sublime Mystery of the Incarnation itself—*The Word was made Flesh, i.e.* complete Man. But before this final apotheosis of a lowly word, S. Paul had used the word many, many times in his Epistles in its high Hebrew sense.

This will explain why the ancient baptismal Creed, which can be traced back to the early part of the second century, and was probably Apostolic in its origin, expresses thus the doctrine of our resurrection: " I believe in the resurrection of the flesh," as in the Western baptismal Creed of to-day. That is not only the ancient form of the baptismal Creed in both East and West, but it is wider and broader and more expressive than the form of words which came to be used in the Creed of the English Church in the sixteenth century, and is now commonly used in English-speaking communities, including the Roman Church in England and America, viz. " I believe in the resurrection of the body." The ancient form—" the resurrection of the flesh "—expresses our belief in the rising again of a full and complete humanity, including, of course, the body, but not laying undue stress upon body as distinguished from the soul. The expression, " resurrection of the body," occurs in S. Augustine and other writers, but it never was admitted into the Creed until a comparatively recent date, and then only for popular use and never in the baptismal service of the Western Church.

The story of the change of the ancient form into "I look for the resurrection of the dead" in the "Nicene" Creed is touched upon in Chapter IX, pp. 154–5. It will be enough to say here that the Greek Bishops, who alone were in the first instance responsible for the change, had forgotten the Hebrew parentage of the word used for "flesh," and naturally enough wished to protect their people from a word which in its purely Greek sense could lead to misunderstanding. The Christian Creed never committed itself to a belief in the resurrection of the *flesh* in the Greek sense of that word, *i.e.* in a resurrection of natural human flesh, as we see and touch it and feel it now. It does proclaim our belief in the resurrection of full and complete humanity, transformed, exalted, glorified. So says New Testament Holy Scripture, so says Holy Church.

CHAPTER IV

PREACHED TO A HOSTILE WORLD

OUR brief review of New Testament teaching on the subject of the resurrection of the body will have shown how vital to the Christian Religion is this doctrine. It is no mere question of a secondary matter. It is so intimately a part of the religion of the Incarnation that the most skilful surgery could not cut it out without inflicting mortal injury on the whole body. This has been recognised from the very first, and by none more clearly than by S. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 12–19). If there is no resurrection of the body then Christ did not rise again, and if He did not overcome Death for Himself, how can He have conquered it for His followers? The Apostle's inexorable logic tears away all disguises and compels us to face the naked truth. If He could not or did not bring His own Body safely through the ordeal of death, if He did not bring it, freed from all that is gross and of the earth earthy, triumphantly to His Father's Right Hand, we may go on in our

groaning and travailing, "waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our bodies" (Rom. viii. 23).

The beautiful dream of the complete restoration of the complete man is still an idle dream. We have been deceived; and for this no promise of a partial salvation can console us. There is no sure standing ground. The sacred Scriptures lie. The constant, confident, unshaken belief of Christians, to which saints and martyrs have held fast through every sort of trial and persecution, was an unsubstantial mirage. If their testimony, the witness of the Bible and the Church, unfaltering from the first, is set aside

on that head, how can any reliance be placed on anything else that they purport to teach? To be buried [1] in Baptism with a Body that did not rise again, is a poor pledge of a mystical resurrection to newness of life. To sustain that new life by feeding on a Body [2] that long ago mingled with its kindred dust is as gruesome an idea as it is uninspiring. It is worse than feeding on wind. Wind, if unsustaining, is sweet and clean and wholesome. To be thrown back on the charnel house, when we were led to believe that the glorious Substance that emerged victorious from the tomb, that had shed all which bound It to time and space and sense, was to impart to us of Its own abounding treasures of immortal life and spiritual might, is to outmock mockery, and dash the cup of hope from our lips. To substitute the *dulce consortium*, the sweet union of soul and body, transfigured and adapted for eternal life in the spiritual world, for a shadowy spirit-life is a chilling exchange. It is to throw over Christ for Plato.[3] No fine phrases can hide for long the ghastly fact that we have been betrayed, for no finer phrases than Plato's have ever flowed from human pen in praise and picture of a spirit happiness. Betrayed we have been, if the Christian hope is to be resolved into a mere Platonic survival of the spirit, and not of the whole man.

I am the Resurrection

is an empty pretence, if it means no more than Plato's vision and promise.

[1] We were buried with Him through Baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life (Rom. vi. 4).

[2] Take, eat; this is My Body (Matt. xxxvi. 27). For My Flesh is meat indeed (John vi. 55).

[3] Plato's doctrine of the transmigration of souls (*Phædrus*, 248–9; *Meno*, 81 *sq.*; *Phædo*, 70, 91; *Tim.* 42, 91 D; *Laws*, 10, 903–4) involved the total extinction of the body, vacated by the soul at death for another body. The body is to him a source of evil, *Phædo*, 66; *Tim.* 70 E; is the "tomb" (σῆμα) of the soul, *Crat.* 400; the "prison" of the soul, *Phædo*, 81–3. The dissolution of soul and body is preferable to their union, *Laws*, 8, 828; *Crat.* 403, last sentence; Socrates looks forward to being "altogether without the body," *Phædo*, 114 C. Contrast with this his doctrine of the immortality of the soul, *Phædrus*, 245; *Meno*, 81, 86; *Phædo*, 70, 91, 105 *sq.*; *Rep.* 10, 608; *Laws*, 4, 713 E, 12, 967 E.

The resurrection of the body has been the touchstone of faith from the beginning and is so to-day. It is not a mere side-issue of the Christian faith, it is integral. It differentiates the Christian from all other religions. There are more or less clear intimations of it, foreshadowing the great truth, in myth, and symbol, and half-understood burial rites of antiquity. Men's longing for they hardly knew what becomes half articulate in the Old Testament. And as the time of its unveiling in the teaching and Resurrection of Christ drew near, the great expectation found voice in Hebrew seers, but a voice that was still earthbound, and could only sing of a renewal of earthly conditions [1] under happier skies in that resurrection life of its songs.

Into what sort of a world was the high spiritual doctrine of the resurrection of the body launched? What were the prevailing intellectual ideas about the body? It is safe to say that the prominent place assigned to this doctrine in the New Testament and in the Fathers generally cannot be properly appreciated without some definite idea of the background of thought and sentiment against which the Christian doctrine is made to stand out so clearly. It

[1] Cf. *Ethiopic Enoch*, dated by Dr. Charles, 166–161 B.C., and especially Chapter 10:—

The felicity of the blessed is of a very sensuous character. The powers of nature are increased indefinitely. Thus the righteous will beget 1000 children, of all the seed that is sown each measure will bear 10,000 grains, and each vine will have 10,000 branches, and each branch 10,000 clusters, and each cluster 10,000 grapes, and each grape 25 measures of wine!

See Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 189. This exuberant sensuousness is silently corrected by our Lord when He says that—

they that are accounted worthy to attain to that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, for neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels (Luke xx. 35–6).

Hence it is a familiar thing in the Fathers to find a contrast drawn between the Christian spiritual conception of the resurrection and the Jewish carnal conception, *e.g.* S. Augustine:—

For the Jews certainly believed in a resurrection of the flesh, but they thought that at the resurrection the flesh would be such as that which they had in this world, and so thinking carnally they were not able to answer the Sadducees when they raised the question as to whose wife the woman would be, whom seven brothers in succession had had to wife (Serm. cccIxii. 18).

P. L. Tom. 38, p. 1623, and see Enarr. in Ps. 65, 1, P. L. Tom. 36, p. 786. S. Augustine calls the entertainment of carnal notions of the future life *Judaice sentire, i.e.* to have Jewish notions.

meant nothing short of a revolution. Men were asked to change completely, not only their thought and speech about the body, but to alter their ingrained habits and immemorial customs. Just because that revolution has partially taken place, we are apt to forget how universal in the ancient world was contempt for and depreciation of the body. And that not merely amongst the rude and uneducated. Poet, philosopher, religionist vied with one another in declaring the insignificance and transitoriness of the body.

When attention is called to this attitude of the ancient world towards the body, it would be at once admitted by all students, so that there is little need to labour the point. But a few words summing up the position may be permitted. And the series of admirable articles in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* ("Body," vol. ii. pp. 755-774) will supply the necessary summaries.

The general Eastern dualistic division of the universe into spirit and matter, the latter being evil and only evil continually, is well illustrated in Buddhism :—

> The Buddhist attitude towards the body has been summed up as follows : (1) the body, whether of men or of higher beings, can never be the abode of anything but evil ; (2) final deliverance from all bodily life, present and to come, is the greatest of all blessings, the highest of all boons, and the loftiest of all aims.[1]

These words of Sir M. Monier-Williams give a good description of the idea which runs through all Eastern philosophy under widely varying forms of expression. A similar estimate of the body prevailed amongst the great Greek and Roman teachers and philosophers, including Plato himself.[2]

[1] *Encycl. Religion and Ethics*, vol. ii. p. 758.

[2] This estimate on the part of the Greeks of the moral worthlessness of the body was found to be compatible with the keenest appreciation of its physical beauty. No nation of antiquity has left more imperishable monuments of their delight in the fairness of the human form than the Greeks, nor been at greater pains to cultivate and develop its energies. On coin, on vase, on frieze, in bust and statue live before our eyes the loveliest idealisations of human feature and figure that the hand of man has ever fashioned. Sports, games, gymnastics, were a regular part of the training of youth. S. Paul duly appreciates the value of this aspect of Greek culture. Bodily exercise (γυμνασία) is profitable, though it is

In sober truth the body is the source of all that harms the soul. For although evil may be the soul's own act, she would have no promptings to evil-doing were she not imprisoned in the body. Every misfortune, every guilty deed in human life, emanates in the last resort from the body.[1]

Posidonius, who flourished during our Lord's lifetime on earth,

holds that the body is an impediment to the heaven-born soul, pining in her prison-house for her ethereal home. To deliver the soul as far as possible from the body even in this life, to shun as a pestilence the lusts and appetites that originate in the body—this is the paramount task of mankind. The body rests as a clog upon the divine capacity of the spirit.[2]

Seneca (*Ep.* cii. 23) says:—

Therefore we ought fearlessly to look forward to the fated hour. It is the last for the body, but not for the soul. That which you bear about with you in this life is no more to be considered than your luggage at a halting place.[3]

But Epictetus is virulent in contempt for the body:—

The body is by nature dead, mere clay and filth. . . . Man is a soul carrying a corpse.[4]

For Marcus Aurelius, too,

there exists a keen antagonism between body and soul, and he too speaks repeatedly of the body in tones of passionate scorn.[5]

These testimonies as to what the highest minds in the world outside Israel held, just before, during, and immediately after the Advent, will give some notion of what the Christian teachers had to face in their endeavour to restore the

only for the short time of this life and in but a small degree compared with the exercise of piety, which is profitable in all ways (1 Tim. iv. 8). His keen appreciation of the athletic games and the discipline necessary for success in them is conveyed in his spirited reference to the foot-races and boxing contests in 1 Cor. ix. 24–7.

[1] *Encycl. Religion and Ethics*, vol. ii. p. 770.

[2] *Ib.* p. 771.

[3] Cf. Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh*, p. 133, on Seneca's teaching:—

The body is for him a temporary decadent affair, a burden on the soul, a check on ambition, but he goes no farther in the philosophy of the matter. There is no suggestion that it is, by virtue of a corrupting quality in matter, a positive source of moral evil.

[4] *Encycl. Religion and Ethics*, p. 772.

[5] *Ib.* p. 772.

body to its true place of dignity in thought and action. Only in Jewry of the ancient world was man conceived of as a unity, and a unity of soul and body which was to continue in the other world.[1] But even there some deductions must be made. As we have seen, Jewish ideas of the body when resumed by the soul at the resurrection, were apt to be materialistic, a resuscitation, a reanimation rather than a resurrection in the Christian sense. And Philo, the greatest of first-century Jewish writers outside Palestine, had accepted the current teaching of the pagan philosophers on this subject :—

> As matter was incurably evil there could of course be no resurrection of the body. Our present life in the body is death ; for the body is the " utterly polluted prison " of the soul ; nay, more, it is its sepulchre.[2]

But with the partial exception of the Jewish Church there can be no doubt that in theory and practice a low estimate of the body prevailed throughout the civilised world. The theory that the body is inherently evil led and leads in practice to two totally different conclusions, both quite logical—either merciless asceticism or reckless exploitation of the body's capacities for sensuous pleasure. It is

[1] See Mr. I. Abraham's excellent little article in *Encycl. Religion and Ethics*, pp. 772–3.

[2] So Dr. Charles sums up Philo's teaching regarding the body, *Eschatology*, p. 260.

But it is not so certain that Dr. Charles is right in finding the same teaching in the *Book of Wisdom* xi. 17, i. 4, viii. 20, ix. 15 ; *Eschatology*, pp. 254–6. Goodrick in his valuable edition of *Wisdom* rejects this interpretation and argues very convincingly to the contrary. See especially Additional Notes A and B. Holmes, who edits *Wisdom* in Dr. Charles's two monumental volumes on the *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, neither in the Introduction nor notes speaks so positively as the chief editor :—

> The writer was no doubt somewhat influenced by the Greek idea of the inherent evil of matter, though he probably did not accept it. It is quite possible to admit that the body is the occasion of evil without accepting the dualistic theory that it is the cause of evil (vol. i. p. 550).

And Gregg on *Wisdom*, in the Cambridge Bible for Schools, is definitely on the side of the author's freedom from Platonic dualism, Introduction, p. xliv., and note, p. 86 :—

> He is in fact true to the Old Testament teaching in not asserting that the cause of man's frailty is to be found in his physical nature, or that the flesh is in itself sinful or the seat of sin (Davidson, *Theology of Old Testament*, p. 192).

not very difficult to see to which side the logical balance would dip with the average man.

The greatest of all the Greek philosophers after Plato himself, he to whom Dean Inge has raised recently a worthy memorial, Plotinus the lofty and brilliant thinker of the third century A.D., carried on, nevertheless, the tradition of his school, that matter is essentially evil, and consequently that the body is a thing of naught. One brief citation must suffice :—

> We are twofold, made up of the wild beast that constitutes part of us, and that which is superior to this beast. The body is wild beast animate, but the real man is other and pure of this, since he possesses virtues in his understanding, which indeed have their basis in his soul in separation (from the body), yes, in separation, and it is separable even in this life.[1]

For our present purpose there is no need to pursue the pagan conception of the body further. The schools of heathen philosophy were finally closed in the sixth century. But from early in the second century the Church was faced with a far more insidious danger. Sects arose with a more or less thin veneer of Christian belief, practice, and organisation, which in almost every case called in question the Church's faith in the resurrection, beginning with the Docetæ and going on to the Bogomili and Albigenses in the later Middle Ages. There was in fact a continuous succession of sects, which arose, flourished, spread widely and died down, only to crop up again under a different name. Each had its own peculiarities and eccentricities, but with few exceptions they united in holding consciously or unconsciously the old pre-Christian and anti-Christian belief that matter is inherently evil, and that therefore the body is beneath contempt, incapable of becoming a fit organ for the soul in the spiritual world.

[1] See Creuzer's Oxford Edition of *Plotinus*, vol. i. p. 12. It is not a little strange how complacently Dean Inge regards this tenet of his great Master. The Dean's jibe about the spiritual body, that it peoples the spiritual world

> with creatures in a semi-gaseous condition

is hardly in the best taste (*The Philosophy of Plotinus*, vol. ii. p. 21).

CHAPTER V

SURVIVAL OF PAGAN CONTEMPT FOR THE BODY AMONG PROFESSING CHRISTIANS

TO enable us to realise what the Church had to contend with, and to understand why such emphasis is laid all through her history on the resurrection of the body, it will also be necessary to take a rapid survey of the principal false systems, which claimed the Christian name, and yet denied the teaching of the New Testament regarding the reality of our Lord's Resurrection and therefore of ours. It is a melancholy and monotonous story, and apt to be tedious in the telling, but it is essential to a proper understanding of the current teaching of the Church at any given moment. The sinister thread that runs through it all is the persuasion that the body is not a true part of ourselves, but an alien, hostile, inherently corrupt, and merely temporary adjunct of our true personality.

We shall confine ourselves to the main heretical systems, and in their case only deal with that element in them which is connected with our present subject, and that as briefly as possible, giving references to easily accessible books in English in which they are described more at large.

Docetism,[1] or the belief that our Lord's Body was not a real but only a phantom body, is the earliest of all these attempts to combine a certain amount of Christianity with the prevalent theory that matter is evil. It is traceable in one disguise or another all through the Christian centuries in all partial versions of our religion, including " Christian

[1] See Du Bose, *The Œcumenical Councils*, pp. 64–8; Duchesne, *The Early History of the Church*, vol. i. p. 59; Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, vol. ii. c. xv.

Science." [1] There are clear indications that it had begun as early as S. Paul's day. Note the emphasis which the Apostle lays on Christ's being

born of the seed of David according to the flesh (Rom. i. 3). Cf. Rom. ix. 5, the Fathers, of whom is Christ according to the flesh ; Gal. iv. 4, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman.

Docetists invariably began by a profession of strictest abstemiousness :—

Touch not, taste not, handle not

were watchwords. In the passage Col. ii. 20–3, S. Paul is believed to be protesting against this perversion of Christian abstinence from things in themselves innocent and good. These prohibitions, he says,

have indeed a shew of wisdom, in will-worship, and humility, and severity to the body, but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh.

The depreciation [2] of marriage generally accompanied Docetic teaching. This feature seems to be touched on in 1 Tim. iv. 1–5 :—

But the Spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall fall away from the faith . . . forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer.[3]

The Epistles of S. John have distinct warnings against

[1] See Wiggins, *Life of Mrs. Eddy*, p. 337.

[2] This is something different in kind from the recognition by our Lord (Matt. xix. 11, 12) and S. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 32–5) of a vocation to the single life in certain cases. The Christian call to virginity is individual and special. It is exceptional and not the general rule. Holy Matrimony, which the Church honours as one of the lesser sacraments, is the high vocation of all who have not received the other call. It is futile to discuss which is the higher.

[3] Cf. Heb. ii. 14–18 :—

Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, He also in like manner partook of the same, etc.

Docetism. The First opens with an emphatic assertion of the reality of our Lord's Humanity :—

That which was from the beginning, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled . . . declare we unto you (i. 1–3).

Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know we the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God: and this is the spirit of the antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already (iv. 1–3).

S. Ignatius, the disciple of S. John, writing on his way to martyrdom about a generation later, asks :—

Why am I a prisoner, if the Lord only seemed to suffer, as these godless unbelievers say, being themselves mere seeming? If that were so, I die for nothing.[1]

Just before, he had told his correspondents that they were to stop their ears when any one spoke apart from Jesus Christ :—

Who was of the family of David, Who was truly born of the Virgin Mary, both ate and drank, truly suffered under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died in the sight of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, Who also truly rose again from the dead, His Father raising Him up, His Father Who also in like manner will raise up us who believe in Him through Christ Jesus, apart from Whom we have no real life.

[1] *Trall.* 9. Cf. the first seven chapters of the Epistle to the Smyrnæans, which passionately insist on the reality of the human life of Christ, which the Docetists contended was only a seeming life. See Lightfoot's notes throughout *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. ii.

The opposition to Docetism is a main characteristic of Ignatius.

See also Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, ch. vii. :—

For every one that confesses not that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, is antichrist; and he who confesses not the testimony of the Cross is of the Devil, and whoever perverts the oracles of the Lord according to his own fancies and says there is neither resurrection nor Judgment, such an one is the firstborn of Satan.

Cf. also Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 35; and Irenæus, *Hær.* III. iii. 4; P. G. Tom. 7, pp. 851–2.

Docetism was one of the earliest attempts to fit in some recognition of Christ with the dualistic philosophy, which is destructive of all Christian teaching about God and man. But it is only one form of a far more widespread movement, which under the name of Gnosticism [1] troubled the Church in the second and third centuries. It professed to unite Christianity with a claim to higher knowledge of the processes of creation, and of the origin of evil. Its fantastic fairy tales were all conceived in the interests of the popular philosophy which was taught in the heathen schools and had got possession of men's minds. Matter was the enemy. Therefore it could not have been created by the Good God. It was eternal as He was, or it had been created by a lower and hostile Divinity. All sorts of fanciful intermediaries fenced off God Himself from any contact with so vile a thing as matter. It is easy to see that the Incarnation was a real offence to one who accepted that theory. That the Son of God should abase Himself to become man, who is compounded of matter and spirit, was an incredible idea. It was easier to conceive the union of light and darkness than to believe that God, remaining God, took upon Him real humanity, and above all that He not only had a true human body on earth, but raised it up again and carried it up into heaven. The Gnostics rejected the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Ascension on the ground that God could not join to Himself anything so incurably evil as a material body. Consequently they rejected the general resurrection.

Gnosticism merged into Manichæism,[2] which took up into itself and made still more popular the doctrine of two eternal things parallel, independent and irreconcilable—Good as represented by God, and Evil or matter in constant and never-ceasing conflict. This particular form of protean Gnosticism flourished from the latter part of the third

[1] See Duchesne, *Early History of Church*, vol. i. ch. xi.; Pullan, *History of Early Christianity*, ch. x.; Cheetham, *Church History, Early Period*, ch. v.; and Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, a little old-fashioned now. Gwatkin's chapter on Gnosticism is lively and informing, if one bears in mind his tendency to belittle the Church and her teaching.

[2] See Duchesne, *Early Church*, vol. i. pp. 404–411.

century until well into the thirteenth century in the East. Its adherents claimed that their system was a direct revelation from heaven to one Mani or Manes, from whom they take their name.[1] There was a regularly organised society. The main body was known as Hearers or Combatants, who were allowed to marry. The inner circle was known as the Elect, who were forbidden to marry, abstained from both flesh and wine, were not to gather even fruit or vegetables, or possess property, and were entirely dependent on the Hearers for maintenance. Within the inner circle was an elaborate Hierarchy, culminating in a sort of Pope who resided in Babylon.

The Manichæans ceased to exist in the West as an organised body about the end of the sixth century. But similar teaching, combined with other characteristics, which need not be detailed in this connection, was handed on by the Paulicians.[2] This offshoot of Manichæism originated in Armenia in the seventh century and spread all over the East, some small remnants of them having persisted in Armenia itself down to the nineteenth century. They made their way into the West also, and were amongst the influences that prepared men's minds for the upheaval of the sixteenth century, though the name had been forgotten. Other organisations under other names[3] and

[1] It is curious to find that this idea of a god who is not Almighty should be revived in our own day as something quite new by Mr. H. G. Wells in *God the Invisible King*. A god limited in himself by the nature of things is different in kind from the Christian God, who limited Himself by His own voluntary act in creating the world, and especially in creating man and endowing him with free-will. The Son of God further limited Himself, by His own loving choice, in becoming man that He might redeem man from the consequences of his misuse of free-will. God's voluntary self-limiting has a far end in view from the beginning, that is, the eventual triumph over the evil that has crept into a world originally good. Almighty in the Creed means: (1) able to do all that He wills to do, uncontrolled by anything higher than Himself; and (2) that all might or power comes from Him, however it may be misdirected temporarily by His allowance and even used against Himself. The vindication is ever present to God Himself. We do not always see it. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints (Rev. xiii. 10).

[2] See Conybeare's *Key of Truth;* Bury's Edition of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. vi. pp. 110–124, vii. p. 279; Hardwick's *Church History, Middle Ages*, pp. 68–84; Lombard's *Pauliciens, Bulgares et Bonshommes en Orient et en Occident.*

[3] Cathari, Priscillianists, Bogomili, etc. See Milman's *Latin Christianity*, or any good Church History.

with some differences in detail carried on the false teaching.

The twelfth century saw a recrudescence of the malady. Milman speaks of Manichæism being rampant everywhere in that century.[1] The most extensive and widely spread of these bodies during that and the following centuries were the ill-starred Albigenses.[2] The tragic folly of the Church authorities in calling in the secular arm to suppress these people by the most hideous cruelties must not blind our eyes to the virulent and anti-Christian doctrines which they professed. Their violent anti-sacramentalism commends them to some in our own days. This was only an outcome of the root trouble, the ancient enemy, the old pagan dualism, which from the first preaching of the Gospel had been at mortal grips with the religion of the Incarnation. No matter how specious and plausible their profession of respect for the New Testament might be, no matter how widespread and deep-seated might be the abuses in the Church which they professed to deplore and condemn, here were people who taught a doctrine which subverted the New Testament and made its message of salvation nugatory. It is perfectly possible that many of the Albigenses did not see that the Manichæan doctrine of the intrinsic evilness of matter strikes at the life of the Christian religion with the irresistible force of logic. It is a blunt denial that God is the Creator of all things visible and invisible, that He is Supreme in the Universe. Further, it not only rules out Sacraments, in which He uses material things of His creation for spiritual purposes, but, if it be true, He could not have sent His Son into the world, that He made and loved—loved because He made it—to assume man's material as well as his spiritual nature in order to redeem it and bring it back to the perfection for which He originally designed it. In a word, the whole Gospel of our redemption is nullified. It is inconceivable that the Son of God should have come down from heaven and become man for us and

[1] *Latin Christianity*, vol. v. p. 402.

[2] Not to be confused with the Waldenses, a comparatively orthodox and local sect, which continues to this day.

for our salvation if man is composed in part of a thing inherently evil. Not only did the Albigenses quite consistently deny the resurrection of the body, but marriage was looked down upon and was strictly forbidden to the Perfect, though concubinage was allowed so long as it did not involve the supreme crime of having children. If carried out consistently the cult would not only have destroyed the Christian religion but have led to the extinction of the human race. Yet it had a great vogue in the South of France, in Spain, and in Belgium. It was very vigorous, in spite of all efforts at persuasion and of the lamentable attempts at forcible suppression in the time of S. Thomas of Aquinum, and accounts for a noticeable stiffening of the Saint's language in connection with the resurrection of the body. Like the Paulicians before them, the Albigenses were not averse to using orthodox language in a non-natural sense, in order to get themselves out of a difficulty.

Such was the background against which the Church from her earliest years had to maintain the great truths of the Creation and of the Creator's sovereignty over it, of the true humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ, His Birth, Life, Death, Resurrection, and Session as true Man at the Father's Right Hand, of His coming again to judge the quick and the dead, when raised by Him true complete men in body as well as soul. If we bear in mind the hostile atmosphere in which the Faith had to be taught, it will be easier to understand the stress that was laid on the resurrection of the body as a test truth. Its immense driving power in the region of morals was always borne in mind, but indubitably it was regarded also as a proof that the doctrine of our Lord's true humanity had been grasped.[1]

Manichæism,[2] of which the Albigensian movement is only one of the most virulent manifestations, is not a

[1] For the painful story of the Albigenses and their cruel persecution, see Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. v. pp. 428 ff.; Hardwick's *Church History, Middle Ages*, pp. 286 ff.

[2] The term Manichæism is used as a convenient description of Eastern and Græco-Roman dualism in its Western guise, without prejudging the question whether Manes himself was a thoroughgoing Manichæan. Some doubt is thrown on this in the article on Manichæism in Hastings' *Encycl. Religion and Ethics*, vol. viii. p. 397.

Christian heresy so much as a rival religion. It is an explanation of the universe absolutely subversive of Christianity. In the Christian view the universe is God's handiwork, subject for a time to disorders owing to His grant of free-will to His intelligent creatures, angels and men, at all times and everywhere the object of His loving care, and destined in due time to be restored to perfect harmony—that far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves. Manichæism, on the other hand, seeks to simplify the problem of the existence of evil by postulating another power than God, which is responsible for matter, matter being the origin and cause of evil. It is the apparent simplicity of this explanation which makes it attractive to the simple and uneducated. This and the removal of all responsibility for the moral failures in our own lives, when we are supposed to be in the grip of a power as eternal as God but essentially evil. The Christian worships a God who planned and made a world in which free beings can live in conscious, joyous freedom and freely return the love which called them into being. He of His own free act accepted the consequent risks, for freedom involves the risk of its misuse, otherwise it would not be freedom. If He wanted a dance of perfect puppets for His amusement, then He could not grant them freedom. But He gave freedom with all its possibilities, and He does not step in at every moment to prevent its wrong exercise, as if He had made a mistake in creating free beings. At every moment He is at hand to help all who are willing to be helped. His power and wisdom, presided over by Love, which is Himself, are concerned to resolve all discords, right all wrongs, compensate all sufferings, dry all tears. And as a pledge of this infinite love of His towards His creatures He sent His Son into the world.

> For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved (John iii. 17).

The complete recovery of the world is a long, long process, but it is worthy of God. Men, however, are impatient, and their tendency to Manichæism is an age-long evidence of

this. It was already in possession of men's minds when Christ came, for the root principle of the dominant Eastern and Græco-Roman philosophy is identical with that of Gnosticism and Manichæism, which in countless disguises and associated with a great variety of other notions have confronted the Church from the very beginning.

It would be the greatest possible mistake to think that when Manichæism, under whatever name, ceased to be an openly organised body, it ceased to exist. It crops up again and again in the most unlikely places, and often is held unconsciously. It is no unfamiliar thing to hear total abstinence from flesh or from wine advocated, quite unconsciously, on Manichæan principles.[1] Sometimes, too, the asceticism of the Saints is described in terms tinged with Manichæan ideas, but their own high sanity and their familiar use of the sacraments saved them from the taint.

Premising, then, that this subtle, ingrained relic of paganism has confronted the Church in all ages of her history, and not least in our own, we will proceed with our investigation of the records, which successive generations of Christians have bequeathed us, expressing their faith in the resurrection of the body, that article of the Creed so especially obnoxious to the declared or unavowed Manichæans of ancient and of modern times.

But first it will be necessary to explain why the following chapters are divided as they are. The date of the Council of Constantinople is a waymark in the history of the Church for two reasons, one familiar, the other less commonly understood. In the first place, the second General Council (A.D. 381) gave us the Creed universally used in Christendom, commonly called the Nicene. This marked the close of that great period during which the Church was driven, under stress of controversy, to search her consciousness and express in exact terms that message with which she had been charged by her Divine Head and Master. At

[1] Abstinence from any article of food or drink on grounds of health, or self-discipline, or of example can be laudable and Christian, but to abstain from or try to induce others to abstain from flesh or wine or tea or any other material thing as being inherently evil is Manichæism pure and simple.

the same time it marks the beginning of a process, little apparent and not suspected then, of that drawing apart of Eastern and Western Christendom, which culminated in formal separation some centuries later, to the great loss of both East and West.

Constantine had built New Rome on the Bosphorus with no object of dividing the Empire, and still less of dividing the Church, but it worked out to that unforeseen and undesired result. For however strongly men felt on the trivial differences which ostensibly led to the Great Schism, the real rock on which the Unity of the Church came to grief was the question of precedence between Old and New Rome. It was the Council of Constantinople which gave the See of New Rome precedence next to Old Rome over the other and older Patriarchates. The elevation of Constantinople to this dignity was accepted grudgingly by the ancient capital of the Empire. And though both continued to proclaim the same faith in all essentials, as indeed they do to-day, there gradually crept in a noticeable difference of accent and emphasis on this or that point of belief or practice. This slight difference of stress begins to be noticeable regarding the resurrection of the flesh from the time of the Second Council. It will be convenient, therefore, to combine the consideration of Eastern and Western teaching in a single chapter to the time of the Council of Constantinople. After that, Eastern and Western teaching will be treated apart, and far more space will be needed for Western than for Eastern. For the doctrine of the Creed on this subject met with far more continuous and strenuous opposition in the West than in the East.

The doctrine of the Creed involves two great issues: (1) the identity that subsists between the risen body and the body of this life, between the spiritual body and the natural body; and (2) the vast change that passes over the natural body in the process or act of becoming the spiritual body. The tendency in the West has been to emphasise the first, at times to the slurring over of the second. The East spoke more readily in terms of change. Either, if challenged, would unhesitatingly have confessed both the identity and

the change. Whether the stress laid on the identity by Western preachers and theologians was the cause or the result of Manichæan opposition may be debated. The present writer has gained the impression that Christian writers and speakers of the West were driven to lay stress on the identity of the risen with the earthly body by the strong undercurrent in the popular mind of Manichæan prejudice against the resurrection of the body, and particularly by the readiness of some (after the example of the Paulicians, and not of them only) to recite the Creed and use its phrases in an esoteric sense of their own, whilst rejecting the natural and historic meaning of the words.

CHAPTER VI

IN THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE

THE resurrection of the flesh holds a foremost place in the teaching of the first three centuries after the Apostles, just as it does in the New Testament records of Apostolic doctrine. This is fully borne out by the extant writings of the time, from which we now proceed to extract the more prominent passages bearing on the subject. A very large proportion of the writings of these centuries has unfortunately perished, but the titles of the lost books, and references to them, and quotations from them in subsequent writers show how insistently this distinctively Christian doctrine was proclaimed. The following summary keeps roughly to the chronological order of the books quoted, but sometimes the exact date is not known to a year or two, and some of the writers overlap in date.

S. Clement, 1 *Cor.*, A.D. 95.—The earliest extant Christian document, after the New Testament, is an Epistle from S. Clement, writing as representative of the Roman Church to the Church of Corinth. S. Clement was Bishop of Rome, in the third place after S. Peter and S. Paul,[1] and wrote to compose a quarrel at Corinth.[2] He wrote in Greek, which

[1] Observe that this is the way in which Irenæus (*Cont. Hær.* III. iii. 3, P. L. Tom. 7, p. 849) in the second century describes S. Clement and other early Roman Bishops. So, for example, in the same chapter, he describes Xystus as "sixth from the Apostles," and Eleutherus as "in the tenth place from the Apostles." He never speaks of the Roman Bishops as being in succession from S. Peter, but always reckons their place in the succession from the *two* Apostolic Founders. He does not reckon the two Founders or either of them as Bishops of Rome. S. Irenæus had spent years in Rome and must have known the Roman tradition of that early time.

[2] Lightfoot places the Epistle of Barnabas still earlier, A.D. 70–79, *Ap. Fath.* part i. vol. ii. p. 509, but this date is not generally accepted as certain. See Lake, *Ap. Fath.* I. p. 338.

at that time and for some time later was the official language of the Roman Church, and in or about A.D. 95.[1] He devotes four chapters (xxiv.–xxvii.) to the resurrection :—

Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord continually points out to us that there will be a future resurrection, of which He made the Lord Jesus Christ the firstfruits in that He raised Him from the dead. Let us look, beloved, at a resurrection regularly taking place at its proper season. Day and night show us a resurrection. Night falls asleep, day wakes up ; day departs, night comes on. Let us take the crops : how and in what way does the sowing take place ? The " Sower went forth " and cast the seeds singly into the ground, and they fall on to the ground, parched and bare, and become decayed : then from their decay the might of the Lord's providence raises them up, and from one grain more grow and bear fruit.

Then he quotes at length the story of the fabled phœnix, as told by Herodotus and Pliny,[2] as a parable of the resurrection.

Do we then esteem it a great and wonderful thing that the Creator of all will bring about the resurrection of those who have served Him piously in the confidence of a good faith, when He shows us the greatness of His promise through a bird even ?

For He says somewhere :—

And Thou shalt raise me up and I will praise Thee (Ps. xxviii. 7, LXX), and I laid me down and slept ; I rose up again, for Thou art with me (Ps. iii. 5, LXX).

And again Job says [3] (xix. 26, LXX) :—

And Thou shalt raise up this my flesh which has endured all these things. . . . When He will, and as He will, He will do all things, and none of the things determined by Him shall fail.

Epistle of Barnabas, about 100 A.D.—The so-called Epistle of Barnabas, once thought to be by the Apostle Barnabas, but now generally held to be a work written towards the end of the first or beginning of the second century, speaks

[1] Lightfoot, *Ap. Fath.* part i. vol. i. p. 342.
[2] Herod. ii. 73 ; Pliny, *Natur. Hist.* x. 2. See Lightfoot's note, *Ap. Fath.* part ii. pp. 84–7.
[3] All his three quotations are from memory and inexact.

of the Resurrection of our Lord and of the general resurrection in chapters v. and vi. of the brief treatise :—

The Prophets, receiving grace from Him, prophesied of Him, and He, in order that He should "destroy death" and show forth the resurrection of the dead, because He must needs be made manifest in the flesh, endured, that He might fulfil the promise made to the Fathers, and Himself prepare for Himself the new People and show, while he was upon the earth, that He Himself will raise the dead and judge them.[1]

"The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" early in Second Century.—The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the romantic discovery of which, after it had been lost for centuries, caused such a stir in the latter part of last century, contains little to our purpose. At the end of the last chapter we read :—

And then shall appear the Signs of the Truth ; first the Sign spread out in heaven, then the Sign of the sound of the Trumpet, and thirdly the resurrection of the dead.

Observe all three are Signs, that is, miraculous occurrences according to Biblical usage from Exodus iv. 8 onwards. The first is that promised by our Lord : *Then shall appear the Sign of the Son of man in heaven* (Matt. xxiv. 30). The second is spoken of by S. Paul : *For the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible* (1 Cor. xv. 52). The third Sign, the actual resurrection of the dead, is evidently regarded as belonging also to the supra-normal order.

The Epistles of S. Ignatius, 100–116.—S. Ignatius was second in succession from S. Peter as Bishop of Antioch in Syria at the beginning of the second century, and was martyred at Rome some time in the reign of Trajan [2] (98–117 A.D.). On his way from Antioch to Rome he wrote certain letters to neighbouring Churches, which had shown kindness to him during his toilsome journey as a prisoner, and one

[1] *Patres Apostolici*, F. X. Funk, vol. i. p. 50.

[2] Lightfoot puts the date thus : His martyrdom may with a high degree of probability be placed within a few years of A.D. 110, before or after (*Ap. Fath.* part ii. vol. i. p. 30).

to the Church at Rome. They bear marks of having been hurriedly written, but incidentally they are the clearest and fullest evidence existing of contemporary Church belief and practice. In the previous chapter (p. 61) we have already had his testimony to the reality of our Lord's Resurrection in His true Body, the model, hope, and source of the resurrection of His people. Other passages may be given setting forth in emphatic terms the identity of our Lord's Risen Body with that which hung upon the Cross :—

For I know that He was still in the Flesh after His Resurrection and I believe Him to be so now. And when He came to those with Peter [1] He said to them : " Lay hold on and handle Me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit." And they immediately touched Him and believed, being joined to His Flesh and Spirit. Wherefore they even despised death, and were found to be above death. And after His Resurrection He did eat and drink with them as being in the Flesh, though in Spirit He was united with the Father.[2]

They [*i.e.* the Docetists] abstain from Eucharist and Prayer because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins and which the Father raised up of His Goodness. They that gainsay the gift of God die through their disputing ; but it were good for them to love, so that they too may rise again.[3]

In unity with God and you I salute your godly Bishop, the reverend presbytery, the deacons my fellow-servants, and all of you individually and collectively, in the name of Jesus Christ, and in His Flesh and Blood, both in His Passion and in the Resurrection of His Flesh as well as of His Spirit.[4]

Epistle of Polycarp to Philippians, A.D. 100–116.—A short but precious letter from S. Polycarp to the Church of Philippi, written before the actual news of the martyrdom of his old

[1] Notice how naturally a successor of Peter at Antioch, as the Antiochene Bishops claimed to be, groups the ten round him, though Peter's name is not mentioned by the Evangelist in this section of his Gospel (Luke xxiv. 36–43).

[2] *Smyrn.* 3.

[3] *Smyrn.* 6. Observe how S. Ignatius still uses the word " flesh " (σάρξ) in the biblical sense of the complete humanity, the whole manhood of our Lord, which suffered on the Cross, rose again the third day, and is given for our spiritual food in the Holy Eucharist (cf. Appendices A, B, and C).

[4] *Smyrn.* 12.

friend S. Ignatius had reached him, contains one or two general references to our Lord's Resurrection and ours. S. Polycarp, born about A.D. 70, was a disciple of S. John, became Bishop of Smyrna in early manhood, and suffered martyrdom in or about the year 155 at the ripe age of eighty-six or more. His Epistle to the Philippians belongs to a time fully forty years before his death :—

Wherefore "girding up your loins serve God in fear" and truth, putting away empty vanity of speech and common error, "*believing on Him Who raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead and gave Him glory*," and a throne on His right hand, "*to Whom are subject all things in heaven and earth*," Who is coming as "*the Judge of the quick and dead*," Whose blood God will require of them who disobey Him. Now "*He Who raised Him*" from the dead "*will also raise us up*" if we do His Will.[1]

For every one that does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh is an antichrist . . . and he that says that there is neither resurrection nor judgment—this man is the firstborn of Satan.[2]

2 *Clement to Corinthians*, A.D. 140–150.—An early Christian Sermon, commonly but erroneously called the second letter of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, is dated A.D. 140 by Lightfoot.[3] It has an important section bearing on the resurrection of the body :—

Let us repent while we are on the earth. For we are clay in the Artist's hand, for just as the potter, if he is making a vessel, and it be bent or broken in his hand, models it afresh ; but if he has reached the point of placing it in the fiery oven, he cannot mend it any more ; so also let us, whilst we are in this world, repent with all our hearts of the wicked deeds that we have done in the flesh, that we may be saved by the Lord, whilst we have a time for repentance. . . . Keep the flesh pure, and the seal (of baptism) undefiled that we may obtain eternal life. And let none of you say that this flesh is not to be judged and does not rise again. Understand ; in what was it that ye were saved ? In what did ye recover your sight, if not in this flesh ? We must therefore guard the flesh as God's temple, for

[1] *Ad Philipp.* 2.
[2] C. 7.
[3] *Ap. Fath.* part i. vol. ii. p. 203.

as ye were called in the flesh, so also shall ye come in the flesh. If Christ, the Lord Who saved us, though He was originally Spirit, became Flesh and so called us, so also shall we receive our reward in this flesh. Let us then love one another that we may all attain to the Kingdom of God.[1]

Martyrdom of Polycarp, A.D. 155 *or* 156.—A contemporary account of the martyrdom of S. Polycarp has come down to us in the form of an official letter from his Church of Smyrna to the Church of the neighbouring city of Philomelium, and is one of the most moving of early Christian records. When they had fastened him to the stake to be burnt alive, and were about to nail him to it as well, he said to the executioners :—

Leave me as I am, for He Who gives me power to endure the fire, will grant me to remain unmoved in the flames even without the security that the nails will give you,

and looking up to heaven he uttered a most beautiful prayer, which his sorrowing people noted down. In this prayer occur the words :—

I bless Thee, that Thou hast deemed me worthy of this day and hour, that I should, among the number of the martyrs, receive a share in the cup of Thy Christ unto the resurrection to eternal life, both of soul and body in the incorruption which the Holy Spirit bestows.[2]

The Shepherd of Hermas, Middle Second Century.—A set of allegories, which became very popular, was written somewhere about 150, a sort of primitive Pilgrim's Progress. This early Bunyan is reputed to have been a brother of Pius, who became Bishop of Rome in 148. The allegories are more concerned with holy living than with doctrine, but the resurrection of the flesh is referred to incidentally in one of the Similitudes :—

The Holy Spirit [3] which proceedeth, which made the whole

[1] 2 *Clem.* 6, 7.
[2] *Mart. Polyc.* 14.
[3] On the confusion here of the Son and Spirit, see Swete's *Holy Spirit in Ancient Church*, pp. 27, 28. Cf. somewhat similar confused language quoted from *Aphraates*, pp. 129 f. If Hermas were to be construed strictly, his loose expressions might be charged with Nestorianism, but the rest of his pious musings show him to be quite free from any such intention.

creation, did God make to dwell in the flesh, which He willed. Therefore this flesh in which dwelt the Holy Spirit served the Spirit well, walking in gravity and purity, nor did it at all defile the Spirit. When, therefore, it had lived nobly and chastely and had laboured with the Spirit, and had worked with Him in everything, behaving mightily and bravely, He chose it as companion with the Holy Spirit, for the conduct of this flesh pleased Him, because it was not defiled while it had the Holy Spirit on earth. Therefore He took the Son and the glorious angels as counsellors, that this flesh also, having served the Spirit blamelessly, should have a place of sojourn, and should not seem to have lost the reward of its service. For all flesh in which the Holy Spirit has dwelt shall receive a reward if found undefiled and unspotted. . . . Keep this flesh of yours pure and undefiled that the Spirit which dwells in it may bear it witness, and that your flesh may be justified. See to it, that the thought never enter your heart that this flesh of yours is perishable, and you abuse it in some sort of defilement. For if you defile your flesh you will defile also the Holy Spirit, and if you defile the flesh, you shall not live.[1]

S. Justin Martyr, born about 114, *death under Marcus Aurelius about* 165.—We come now to one of the most important witnesses as to Christian teaching in the second century, Justin Martyr. He was a native of Nablous (Neapolis) in Syria, studied philosophy at Athens, and became a professor or lecturer in the subject. His interest was aroused by seeing the steadfastness of Christians in persecution, and was further stimulated by reading the Holy Scriptures. He was led on to an interest in the Scriptures by an encounter with an aged and venerable Christian, of which he gives a detailed account in his *Dialogue* with the Jew Trypho.[2] The exact date of his conversion is not known, nor of the publication of his principal works.

Both by pen and tongue he was one of the most powerful influences in defending and spreading the Faith from a decade or more before the middle of the second century until his martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius about the year 165. Many of his works have perished, but two written

[1] *Herm. Sim.* v. 6, 7.
[2] *Dial.* 4–8, P. G. Tom. 6, pp. 475–493.

in defence of Christianity and his dialogue with a Jew, showing forth the Messiahship, are extant. His first Defence is addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138–161), and at the end of Chapter XVIII. he appeals to the Emperor to accept Christians as believers in God no less than were the heathen writers whom he has quoted :—

Accept us as graciously as you do those, since we believe in God no less firmly than they, nay more, for we expect to receive again our own bodies, though they be dead and cast into the earth, for we hold that with God nothing is impossible. For, if we were not already in the body, would anything appear more incredible to a thoughtful person, than if one were to declare it possible that from a tiny drop of human seed bones and sinews and flesh should be formed into a shape such as we see ? . . . But as at first you would not have believed it possible that such persons could be produced from the tiny drop, and yet now you see them thus produced, so also judge ye that it is not impossible that the bodies of men, after they have undergone dissolution and been resolved into earth like seeds, should in God's appointed time rise up again and put on incorruption.[1]

In Chapter LII. he writes of the two Advents, the first, which has already taken place, and the second :—

when He is to come from heaven with glory with His angelic host, when He will raise up the bodies of all the men that have lived, and will clothe those of the worthy with incorruption, but those of the wicked He will send into the everlasting fire with the worthless angels in an everlasting feeling of pain.[2]

S. Justin in another place speaks of men who say there is no resurrection of the dead, but that as soon as men die their souls are taken up into heaven. Do not imagine these men to be Christians,[3] he says.

[1] Ap. I. c. 18, P. G. Tom. 6, pp. 356–7.
[2] Ap. I. c. 52, P. G. Tom. 6, pp. 404–5.
[3] *Dial.* 80, P. G. Tom. 6, p. 665, and cf. the remarkable summing-up of the resurrection doctrine by Tatian, who became a Christian about 150, and was a hearer of Justin: Should my poor body perish by fire, should the universe receive its material dispersed like vapour, should I be torn to pieces by wild beasts—I am stored in the treasuries of a bountiful Master. The things stored up escape the knowledge of the poor atheist, but God who reigns will restore, when He will, the substance (or essence) which is visible to Him alone, to its original state (*Orat. adv. Græcos*, 6, P. G. Tom. 6, p. 820 ; cf. *op. cit.* 20, p. 851).

Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, A.D. 168.—Theophilus, who became Bishop of Antioch in the year 168, tells us that it was the reading of Holy Scripture which set him on the road to becoming a Christian. He was a noted theologian and erudite writer, but only one complete work of his has survived. It is addressed to a heathen friend, named Autolycus, who was inclined to jest at Christian beliefs and among them at the resurrection of the body. He tells his friend, who had mockingly asked to see the Christian God, that if only he will trust himself to the Good Physician who heals men by His Word and Wisdom, in due time he will be admitted to the heavenly vision :—

Man, if you understand these things, living chastely, holily and righteously, you can see God. But before all, let faith and the fear of God have sway in your heart, and then shall you understand these things. When you put off the mortal and put on incorruptibility then shall you see God as you deserve. For God raises up your flesh immortal together with your soul, and then, when you have become immortal, you shall see the Immortal, if you now put your trust in Him ; and then shall you recognise that you spoke unjustly against Him.[1]

Theophilus uses as illustrations of the resurrection : (1) the dying of the seasons and their coming round again, and the recurrence of day and night in succession ; (2) a seed swallowed by a bird and dropped somewhere becoming a mighty tree ; (3) the moon waning and waxing, dying and rising again ; (4) loss of flesh and strength and beauty in sickness, and their recovery when health returns.[2] And he gives his friend the comfortable assurance :—

As man by disobedience brought death upon himself, so by obeying the will of God every one that wishes can secure for himself everlasting life. For he that has carried out the law and holy commandments which God gave can be saved, and attaining his resurrection can inherit incorruption.[3]

Athenagoras on the Resurrection, A.D. 177.—The oldest complete treatise on the resurrection, which has come down

[1] *Ad Autol.* i. 7, P. G. Tom. 6, p. 1036.
[2] *Ib.* i. 13, P. G. Tom. 6, p. 1044.
[3] *Ib.* ii. 27, P. G. Tom. 6, p. 1096.

to us, was written by Athenagoras as a sequel to his *Defence of Christianity*. The *Defence* was addressed to the reigning sovereigns, Marcus Aurelius, and his son Commodus, in the year 177. The last chapter of the *Defence* touches on the subject of the resurrection and promises further consideration of the matter in a later treatise. Both are written in an elegant style and are marked by a wide erudition and a broad humanity. Athenagoras had been a distinguished Athenian philosopher before his conversion. He is reputed to have been studying the Christian Scriptures in order to refute them, but to have been led by them to his conversion instead. No extracts from the treatise *On the Resurrection of the Dead* can give a just idea of its cogency and impressiveness, but space cannot be afforded to transcribe it in full. The first chapter explains his method of procedure and ends with this sentence :—

For with regard to this subject, we find some absolutely unbelieving and some others doubting ; and even among those who have accepted the first principles we find some that are perplexed equally with those that doubt ; and, what is most unaccountable of all, we find that they are in this state of mind without having any ground whatsoever, in the subject-matter itself, for their unbelief ; nor do they find it possible to assign any reasonable cause why they remain in unbelief or perplexity.[1]

He goes on to say he will listen to these men if they can show that God has neither the power nor the will, with regard to our bodies, to unite or gather them together, after they are dead and completely dissolved, so that they should constitute the same human beings again. He appeals to the power of God who made them to remake them again, whatever may have happened to them, even if they had been eaten by wild beasts or cannibals ; for the elements of the bodies, whatever they may be or wherever they may be, are kept in God's treasuries and are known to Him :—

For the bodies that rise again are reconstituted from the parts that properly belong to them ; whereas none of the things

[1] *De Resurr.* 1, P. G. Tom. 6, pp. 976–7.

mentioned (*i.e.* the food, or the mere external, visible and ever-changing material flesh and blood) is such a part nor has it the form or place of a part, nay it does not always remain with the parts of the body which are nourished by it, or rise again with the parts that rise, since no longer does blood, or phlegm or bile or breath contribute anything to the revived life. Neither, again, will the bodies nourished require then the things they once required, seeing that, along with the needs and with the corruption of the bodies nourished, the need of those things by which they were nourished is taken away. . . . Neither does the flesh which takes up (nourishment) always retain what it takes, nor does the flesh so incorporated abide and remain with that to which it was added, but is subject to a variety of changes, at one time being dispersed by toil or care, at another time being wasted by grief or trouble or disease.[1]

Man's inability to make anew his own shattered or worn-out works is admitted, but to argue that therefore God is unable or unwilling to raise again a body after its dissolution, is, in the judgment of Athenagoras, to offer the grossest insult to God's Power and Majesty (chapters 7–10). The resurrection is implied in man's original nature.

A complete man is composed of body and soul.[2] If the soul only rises, it is incomplete. Otherwise we should have to infer that God made a mistake in creating man of two elements in the first instance (chapters 11–13).

Though the resurrection does not rest solely on the fact of a future judgment, yet the judgment, if it is to be just, must be on the composite being who did the acts that are to be judged. Soul and body were united in the acts that are to be rewarded or punished. It would be unjust that only one of the partners in the good or the evil should be assessed [3] (chapter 14).

The very nature of man requires that if he is to continue to exist, he must continue as body and soul. His reason and understanding were given to him as man, not as soul only. If he is to continue to be man, there must be a

[1] P. G. Tom. 6, pp. 985–8.
[2] Cf. Irenæus, *Cont. Hær.* V. vi. 1, P. G. Tom. 7, p. 1137.
[3] Cf. Origen, P. G. Tom. 11, p. 93; a fragment from his first book, *On the Resurrection.*

continuance of his body according to its proper nature (chapter 15).

The temporary interruption of the partnership of soul and body by death is comparable to the interruption of his ordinary activity in sleep (chapter 16).

Man's life on earth sees so many changes of his bodily condition that we need not be surprised at the last change of all, when the body sheds its corruption and becomes incorruptible :—

> Would any one have believed unless taught by experience that the drop of moisture, which constitutes human seed, should alike in all parts prove to have within itself such a variety and number of those powers and masses which arise from it—I mean of bones, and nerves, and cartilages, of muscles, of flesh and all the other parts and potentialities of the body.

A body, moreover, that is constantly changing, in its pre-natal stages, through infancy, maturity, and old age, and gives promise of continuing through one more change :—

> As, therefore, the succession of natural occurrences makes things credible that have not credibility conferred on them by the phenomena themselves—for instance, though the seed has not inscribed upon it the life and form of men, nor has the living thing the prophecy of its dissolution into the primary elements written upon it—much more does reason, tracing out the truth from the natural sequence, afford ground for believing in the resurrection, since reason is a safer and stronger guide than experience for establishing truth[1] (chapter 17).

The argument based on the justice of the final judgment (which he infers from the character of God, the Judge), that body and soul should necessarily be arraigned together, is continued in chapters 18–23. The argument[2] is conducted with truly amazing force, ingenuity, and fertility of resource.

The two final chapters are devoted to an elaboration of the point that man's final happiness and chief end imply a reconstitution of the partnership of soul and body in the future, such as exists in the present life.

[1] P. G. Tom. 6, p. 1008.
[2] Dean Inge finds this argument " curious," *Phil. Plot.* ii. p. 16.

Athenagoras figures so little in most books dealing with early Christian literature that an effort is here made to do him justice. His twenty-five chapters *On the Resurrection of the Dead* are packed with the most closely-knit reasoning, and deserve to be better known and appreciated. They appeal to reason pure and simple, making no use of the authority of Scripture or of the Church, and on this account throw little light on contemporary life and manners.

Consequently they do not lend themselves to quotation on any except their own chosen subject. They were addressed to cultured heathen, who had to be captured, if at all, by reason and not by authority in the first instance. They must have had a profound effect in their own day.

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, 177–202–3.—S. Irenæus, born in Asia Minor in the third or fourth decade of the second century, was a pupil of S. Polycarp, and used to relate in after-life his master's reminiscences of the life and teaching of the Apostle S. John. In early manhood he emigrated to South Gaul, and became Bishop of Lyons in the year 177. He is a link between Eastern and Western theology. By birth and language he is Greek, but he is often thoroughly Latin in outlook. His greatest work, that *Against Heresies*, was written in Greek, of which fragments only remain, but a contemporary translation into Latin is extant. In this work there are many passages concerned with the resurrection of the body, since he treats of the early Docetic and Gnostic heresies which denied it. For the most part he does not go beyond the usual appeals to Scripture and Church teaching, as his book was meant for professing Christians. In Book V. iii. 3, however, there is a passage addressed to reason only, and not invoking authority :—

The flesh is not without its share in the constructive power and wisdom of God. But if the power of Him Who is the Giver of life is made perfect in weakness—*i.e.* in the flesh—let them inform us, when they affirm the incapacity of the flesh to receive God's grant of life, whether they speak thus as being at present living men, or acknowledge that, having no part in life whatever, they are at the present moment dead men. And if they are really dead men, how is it that they move about, and speak and

perform those other functions which are not the actions of dead men but of living? But if they are now alive, and if their whole body partakes of life, how can they venture to assert that the flesh is not qualified to be a partaker of life, since they do confess that they have life at the present moment? It is like as if a man were to take up a sponge full of water, or a torch on fire, and to declare that the sponge could not possibly share in water, or the torch in fire. In this very manner do these men, by alleging that they are alive and bear life about in their members, contradict themselves, when afterwards they represent these members of theirs as being incapable of sharing in life. But if the present temporal life, which is so inferior to eternal life, can nevertheless effect so much as to quicken our mortal members, why should not eternal life, since it is so much more powerful than this life, quicken the flesh which has already held converse with and been accustomed to sustain life? For, that the flesh can really partake of life is shown from the very fact of its being alive, for it lives on as long as it is God's purpose that it should do so. It is manifest, too, that God has the power to confer life upon it, inasmuch as He grants life to us who are in existence. And, therefore, since the Lord has power to infuse life into what He has fashioned, and since the flesh is capable of being quickened, what remains to prevent its sharing in incorruption, which is a blissful and never-ending life granted by God? [1]

This vigorous piece of dialectic, which is, of course, far more telling in the original, shows what the saintly Bishop could have done in the field of pure reason, if it had been his lot to address himself mainly to non-Christians.

S. Irenæus, like S. Ignatius of Antioch, brings the resurrection of the body into close connection with the Eucharist. Indeed it may be said with truth, that the two doctrines stand or fall together. The historic doctrine of the Eucharist and that of the resurrection of the body throw light upon one another. He who believes and understands the one—as far as a mystery can be understood—believes and understands what the Church means by the other. This important truth will be set forth at large later on,[2] but the teaching of S. Irenæus on the point is what concerns us now.

[1] P. G. Tom. 7, p. 1131.
[2] See Chapter XVI.

The two chief passages occur in Books IV. and V. of *Cont. Hær.* In the preface to the former Book S. Irenæus declares that all, however much they might disagree about other matters, ultimately come to this, that

they blaspheme the Creator and disallow the salvability of God's handiwork, which the flesh truly is.[1]

Later in the book he couples the salvation of the body with the reception of the Lord's Body in the Eucharist, giving it to be understood that the Lord's Risen and Glorified Body, though identical with the Body born of Mary, is now a spiritual and heavenly Body given, taken, and received after a heavenly and spiritual manner. So our earthly bodies, which are nourished by that heavenly Food, shall be conformed to the likeness of that Body of glory, still retaining, as His does, identity with our present bodies (IV. xviii. 4) :—

For how can they [*i.e.* the Gnostics] agree, when they say that that bread over which thanks have been given is the Body of their Lord, and the cup His Blood, if they do not call Him Himself the Son of the Creator of the world? . . . Then, again, how can they say that the flesh, which is nourished with the Body of the Lord and with His Blood, goes to corruption and does not partake of eternal life? Either let them change their opinion or decline to offer the aforesaid offerings. But our opinion is in harmony with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn confirms our doctrine. For we offer to Him His own, and we consistently proclaim the fellowship and union of flesh and spirit, and confess our belief in the raising up of both flesh and spirit. For as the bread which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist ; so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, seeing they possess the hope of resurrection to eternal life.[2]

S. Irenæus returns to the same connection of ideas in Book V. At this point he is engaged in refuting the Valen-

[1] P. G. Tom. 7, p. 975.
[2] P. G. Tom. 7, pp. 1027–9. Cf. Ignatius, Eph. 22, *ad fin.* for the Eucharist as " the medicine of Immortality."

tinians and Ebionites, heretical sects who in different ways rejected the reality of our Lord's humanity :—

Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who of His infinite love became what we are, that He might make us what He is. . . .

Vain indeed are those who allege that He appeared in mere seeming. . . . Vain are the disciples of Valentinus who put forth this opinion, in order that they may exclude the flesh from salvation, and cast aside what God has fashioned. Vain are the Ebionites who do not receive by faith into their soul the union of God and man (in the Incarnation). . . . That is why these men reject the commixture of the heavenly wine, and wish it to be water of the world only.[1] He did not truly redeem us by His Blood, if He was not truly made Man ; and for this reason it was that He graciously poured Himself out that He might gather us into the bosom of the Father. But vain in every respect are those who despise the entire dispensation of God, and deny the salvation of the flesh, and treat with contempt its regeneration, saying that it is incapable of incorruption. But if it is not saved, then neither did the Lord redeem us with His Blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His Blood, nor is the bread we break the communion of His Body. For it is not blood, unless it is from veins and flesh and the rest of human substance—that human substance, which the Word of God became.[2] He redeemed us by His Blood, as His Apostle says : "*In Whom we have our redemption, by His Blood even the forgiveness of our sins*" (Col. i. 14). And as we are His members, we are also nourished by His creature (and it is He Himself Who bestows on us this creature, making His sun to rise and His rain to fall according to His will (Matt. v. 45)) ; the chalice, which is of His creation, He declared to be His own Blood, with which He imbues our blood, and the bread—also of His creation—He assured us is His own Body, whereby our bodies grow. Since therefore the mixed chalice and the bread (that is made) receive the Word of God and the Eucharist becomes the Body and Blood of Christ, and from them the substance of our flesh grows and is upheld, how can they say that the flesh is incapable of receiving God's gift, which is life eternal, seeing that it is nourished from the Body and Blood of the Lord and is a member of Him ? Even as the blessed Paul speaks in his Epistle to the Ephesians, saying that we are *members of His*

[1] The Ebionites used water only in their quasi-eucharist.
[2] A quotation of John i. 14, "The Word became Flesh."

Body, of His Flesh and of His Bones (Eph. v. 30). He is not here speaking of a spiritual and invisible man merely—*for a spirit hath not flesh and bones* (Luke xxiv. 39)—but of a genuinely human organism, consisting of flesh, and nerves, and bones, such as is nourished from His chalice, which is His Blood, and receiveth increase from the bread, which is His Body.[1]

There is a natural break here in the flow of Ante-Nicene testimony to the Christian tradition.[2]

[1] *Cont. Hær.* V., *præf.* i. ii., P. G. Tom. 7, pp. 1119–22.

[2] No quotations are taken from Liturgies, Church Orders, Apostolical Constitutions, etc., where the doctrine is merely stated and not discussed.

CHAPTER VII

THE WITNESS OF THE ALEXANDRINE SCHOOL AND OF TERTULLIAN

THE emergence into prominence of the Alexandrine School of Christian teachers and writers at the end of the second century marks a fresh stage in the expression of Christian doctrine, and signifies the adoption of a fresh attitude to the outside world on the part of the Church. Hitherto the glow and fervour roused by the sense of a new revelation had carried Christians on a wave of enthusiasm, which left little time or thought for co-ordinating their faith and practice with the best thought and best methods of the contemporary world. Yet the faith threw fresh light on every subject of human thought. Christian practice, which was based on a few clear principles, had to apply those principles and provide a working code for everyday life in every variety of circumstance. Christian teachers became gradually aware that there were vast problems in human life to which they held the key. The Incarnation, that supreme evidence of the Love of God for the world, had been brought to bear mainly, in the first instance, on the moral evils which afflicted the world. Now it was perceived that to effect a radical cure of moral disorders it was necessary to go deeper than those external symptoms of disease, and to heal the springs of action, from which the turbid waters flowed, by plunging into them the healing wood of the Cross.

This did not mean that the superb energy and *élan* of the first Christian generations were spent. It meant that the swift stream, which had swept along triumphantly as through a mountain gorge, taking little notice of obstacles

nor of surrounding country, began to widen out into a fertilising river. At the Church's heart there had been no indifference to the needs and the problems of mankind. A man may be excused if in the first rapture of marriage he seems only to be devoted to his bride and to be oblivious of all else but the bliss of being alone at length in the companionship of a congenial soul. But he speedily finds that such absorption would become sheer selfishness; and stirred, as he has been, and refreshed and reinvigorated, he gives himself to the tasks of his calling as never before. Yet he does not love his wife the less. The steady flame grows and supplies a driving force to all his other faculties and energies. The Church's honeymoon was those first two centuries of intense rapt concentration on the joy of that inner life and union with God (which was her Head's blood-bought gift to her and marriage dower), and on eager efforts to persuade all and sundry to share in the wedding feast.

Now she had discovered that her persuasions would be addressed in vain to a large part of the humanity, which it was her task to bring into the ark of safety, unless she took a serious share in facing questions that had interested and baffled the best minds of the race. Hitherto she had hardly thought at all of what God had done for others than the favoured nation, which had been the nursery of the new Faith, and for those who were its earliest torch-bearers. But her Master had *other sheep that were not of this fold*. Had He left them altogether uncared for? Not so, she reflected. Of olden time a seer had sung of His mercy being over all His works. Others had proclaimed that He is no respecter of persons. Nay, her own chief Apostle had added to the oft-repeated formula the further extension that in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him (Acts x. 35). The Apostle of Love had given her the assurance that *There was the true Light, which lighteth every man, coming into the world* (John i. 9). Here were bigger thoughts and wider horizons than had occupied her earliest consciousness. Evidently she must look into the methods of her Master's

work in this field, and looking she found much that was amazingly worthy of Him.

It is the unique glory of the famous Divinity School at Alexandria that it was the pioneer in this new region of activity. S. Clement of that city, Head of the School from about 189 to 202 A.D., a much-travelled, highly-cultured, and learned man, is the first of the great line of teachers, specimens of whose works have come down to us. To our unspeakable loss by far the greater part of his literary output has perished. But his extant works are supplemented by the remains of his pupil Origen, who not only overtopped his great master, but has few rivals as a thinker in any age.

This treatise is not a history of the development of Christian thought, and so the fascinating subject of the Alexandrine School must be dropped, but the treatment of our own subject henceforth could not be put in proper perspective with Christian teaching as a whole, unless the reader had a picture in his mind of the Church's fresh enterprise towards the end of the second century. It was a gigantic task, and God raised up intellectual giants to carry it out. Her work in striving to cleanse the Augean stable of moral corruption was so far easy that the world itself was conscious of the need of cleansing and of its own bankruptcy as a moral reformer. All men of good will were ready to welcome the new moral force which the Church brought to bear on inveterate scandals and abuses.

But what would happen when these simple-minded Christian folk, aflame with zeal for righteousness, awoke to find themselves face to face with noble systems of thought, which had been elaborated by the highest minds which humanity had yet produced, admired by and to some extent forming a working code of belief and practice for the choicer elements of the population? It was a test indeed of the gifts of wisdom with which her Head had endowed the Church. How would she act under the guidance of that Holy Spirit, which was "to lead her into all the Truth"? Lead her, that is, not only to be the custodian of truths embodied in a Person and in the Life and Death and

Resurrection of that Person, but to be the continuous interpreter of those truths to all sorts and conditions of men, in all kinds of circumstances, in the face of problems changing with each generation.

S. Clement gives an unhesitating answer. No one lays a firmer finger on the stains and blots of surrounding heathendom.[1] But see his unstinted acknowledgment of the merits of the poets and philosophers of Greece :—

Before the Lord's Advent Philosophy was necessary to the Greeks for righteousness, and now it is conducive to piety, being a kind of preparatory training for men who attain faith by demonstration. *Thy foot shall not stumble*, saith He, if thou referest what is good, whether belonging to the Greeks or to us, to Providence. For God is the Author of all good things ; but of some primarily (for example, the Old and New Testaments), and of others indirectly as, *e.g.* Philosophy. Perhaps, too, Philosophy was given primarily to the Greeks before the Lord called the Greeks also. For it was the Tutor to bring the Greek world to Christ as the Law was to bring the Hebrews (Gal. iii. 24). Philosophy, therefore, was preparatory, guiding into the right path the man that is to be made perfect by Christ. The way, then, of truth is one, but into it as into a never-failing river flow the rills from different sides.[2]

And after a deeply interesting chapter on the benefits of culture, he prefaces his eclectic treatment " of the Stoic, the Epicurean, the Aristotelian philosophy or whatever has been well said by each of these schools of thought," with the remark :—

It is manifest, therefore, that the Greek preparatory culture, together with Philosophy itself, came from God to men.[3]

From this sublime conception that God has not left Himself without witness amongst His creatures anywhere, the Church has never gone back. S. Paul's speech on the

[1] As witness his Exhortation to the Heathen, P. G. Tom. 9, pp. 50–246.

[2] *Strom.* i. 5, P. G. Tom. 8, p. 718. Cf. Justin Martyr's large-hearted anticipation of this teaching : " Those who lived agreeably to Reason are Christians, even though they were reckoned atheists, as were Socrates and Heracleitus and suchlike men among the Greeks. . . . They that lived and live agreeably to Reason are Christians and need not be afraid or disquieted " (*Apol.* i. 46, P. G. Tom. 6, p. 397).

[3] P. G. Tom. 8, p. 732.

Areopagus (Acts xvii. 22–31) already contained the same thought, but it had to wait for its full application, nor is it exhausted yet. To hold herself entirely aloof from the world outside herself, its good as well as its evil, were a simple task, but to acknowledge and make use of the elements of good in it requires a generous measure of the Holy Spirit's guidance. The process of disentangling the good from the evil is beset with pitfalls, and the pioneers in this work did not altogether escape them, as will become apparent in the sequel.

But it is time to return to our own subject, on which the surviving fragments of S. Clement's works contain surprisingly little.[1] This, however, is amply made up for in his great pupil Origen.

Origen, born 185–6, *died* 251–4.—The illustrious Origen[2] succeeded his master, S. Clement, as Head of the Divinity School at Alexandria when only eighteen. Hebraist, student of philosophy and of all the learning of his time, commentator on Holy Scripture and textual critic, indefatigable preacher and lecturer, author—as an admiring contemporary said—"of more books that any one man can manage to peruse," most of which have, alas! perished—naturally he has much to say of the resurrection of the body. Smaller men have been able to find here and there in his writings some fanciful expressions of opinion, which illustrate what has been said above of possible pitfalls which awaited men who first ventured on the uncharted course of bringing the Gospel Revelation into touch with the earlier partial apprehensions of truth, which God had vouchsafed the world outside the favoured circle of Revelation. Pioneer of pioneers, Origen shared the perils as well as the glories of that vocation. No one mortal man, not even a colossal intellect like Origen's,

[1] See, however, *Strom.* v. 1, 9, P. G. Tom. 9, p. 21 :—
For he [*i.e.* Heracleitus], having learnt it from the barbarian philosophy, knew of that cleansing of evil-livers by fire, which the Stoics later called the Conflagration; in which they teach that each will arise exactly as he was, so treating of the resurrection ("treating that very thing, *i.e.* the cleansing, as the resurrection"). And *ib.* v. 14, P. G. Tom. 9, pp. 157, 161. Cf. *Pædag.* i. 6 B, P. G. Tom. 8, p. 284.

[2] Denis' *De la philosophie d'Origène* may be consulted with much profit, though in some respects it hardly does justice to Origen's essential orthodoxy.

can explore all the avenues of knowledge, without losing himself now and then in a side-track that leads to nowhere or ends in a morass. Nor can he hope to descry all the logical implications of every statement he utters or theory which he propounds. Origen makes it perfectly clear that he was no Docetist, when dealing directly with the subject. Yet some expressions of his on other topics have been shown to lead logically to Docetism. There clung to him, too, some remnants of the admired Plato, as *e.g.* a belief in the pre-existence of souls,[1] which has logical consequences entirely destructive of his clearly expressed belief in the resurrection of the body, and so on. But a man should only be held responsible for beliefs definitely declared. Necessary inferences from language not thoroughly weighed and not thought out in all its bearings should be set down to human limitations. The fact that he expressly repudiates elsewhere what may be deduced logically from unbalanced expressions should be taken to show that he had not himself perceived the full force of his words. Origen had poured forth for over forty years a copious stream of speech, lecturing regularly twice a week and sometimes daily, to crowded popular audiences. Many of the lectures were published by admirers from shorthand notes without the benefit of revision by the speaker. Under these circumstances it would be a superhuman feat if he had absolutely escaped the risk of the popular preacher, and had never spoken unadvisedly with his lips.

The eccentricities of genius, too, find some place in him. In no other way can his queer notion be accounted for that spiritual bodies are bound to be spherical in form,[2] or the notion that the stars are living rational creatures, that have bodies.[3]

[1] Origen did not follow Plato so far as to believe in the transmigration of souls, see Bigg's *Christian Platonists*, 2nd Edition, p. 241.

For a searching criticism of " Pre-existence " as raising greater difficulties than it solves, see Dean Rashdall, *Theory of Good and Evil*, vol. ii. pp. 345–7.

[2] *Lib. de Orat.* 31, P. G. Tom. 11, p. 552 ; *De Prin.* i. 7, 3, P. G. Tom. 11, p. 172.

[3] This latter belief was not peculiar to Origen. Xenocrates held it, see Ritter et Preller, *Hist. Philos. Græc.* p. 286 ; and Cicero, *ib.* p. 411 ; Philo, *ib.* p. 500 ; Plotinus, *ib.* p. 535.

But when all these defects have been admitted, the truth remains that Origen was one of the most brilliant thinkers that have confessed the Christian name, and withal a devout and humble man of heart. It is no small source of pride that his essential orthodoxy was vindicated by our own Bishop Bull.[1] The suspicions spread in the West by S. Jerome are now generally admitted to be unfair to this great champion of the Faith.[2]

Origen's thoroughness is amazing. He shirks no difficulty large or small. He is absolutely determined to pursue the truth at all hazards. The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth will satisfy his fearless and penetrating mind. But this uncompromising thoroughness has one drawback. He is quite merciless as to the amount of detail and repetition it entails, when he is bent on getting to the bottom of some question. It may be a knotty problem that he is solving, or it may be one of comparatively trifling importance, but he will go into it in all its windings with an infinite patience which can be very trying to a modern reader. The real fact is that he always has a popular audience in mind. He is essentially the preacher and expounder to ordinary men and women. The crowds that packed his lecture halls for wellnigh half a century are what he is really addressing in his most abstruse passages, not the college don nor the trained scholar. And what a superb compliment he pays those audiences! He never condescends to the arts of the popular lecturer. He is indifferent to mere literary style, but he assumes that "the butcher and baker and candlestick maker" will be able to follow and be interested in the deepest problems of religion,

[1] *Def. Fid. Nic.* vol. v. pp. 286 *sq.*

[2] It has never been sufficiently explained how it came about that S. Jerome, from being an enthusiastic admirer of Origen, became his persistent detractor. He took alarm, perhaps, at some of the expressions indicated above, and his hasty, vehement temper refused to be appeased by Origen's definite declarations of faith in his considered works. Perhaps also S. Jerome's suspicions were strengthened by the use made of these expressions by some who called themselves followers of Origen. Whatever the causes may have been, it was little short of a calamity that at the time when Greek had ceased to be the second language of the learned West, men's minds should have been prejudiced against the greatest of Greek theologians. S. Augustine, fortified by a firsthand knowledge of Origen, would have been an even more irresistible force than he is.

philosophy, and human life, when put before them in clear, unpretentious language, devoid of purple patches, and never consciously running on the lines of conventional eloquence. This is the true explanation of that feature in Origen which the modern student finds sometimes diffuse to the point of long-windedness. His books are, as it were, verbatim reports of popular lectures.

Having seen who and what manner of man he was from whom we are about to quote some specimen passages regarding the resurrection of the body, we shall confine ourselves mainly to a work written in his ripe old age and published by himself and not by indiscreet admirers.

Celsus, an extremely able man, had written one of the most trenchant attacks on Christianity that has ever appeared. Though his book has unfortunately perished, we have a very clear summary of its scope and arguments from Origen's reply to it. It contained a very skilful series of arguments which the anti-Christian writers and speakers of to-day bring forward as something fresh, all unknowing in most cases, that an abler man than themselves said the same things and had his answer eighteen hundred years ago.

Origen refers to the attack of Celsus on the resurrection of the body in these terms :—

> He [*i.e.* Celsus] next assails the doctrine of the resurrection, which is a high and difficult doctrine, and one which more than others requires a high and advanced degree of wisdom to set forth—how worthy it is of God, and how sublime a truth it is which teaches us that there is a seminal principle lodged in that which Scripture speaks of as the "tabernacle" of the soul. It is the "*tabernacle*" in which the righteous "*groan, being burdened, not for that they should be unclothed, but clothed upon*" (2 Cor. v. 4). Celsus ridicules this doctrine because he does not understand it and because he has learnt of it from ignorant persons who were unable to support it on any reasonable grounds.[1]

First he quotes a whole section from Celsus, in which the latter pours scorn on the doctrine, supposing it to mean

[1] *Cont. Cels.* vii. 32, P. G. Tom. 11, p. 1465.

the resuscitation of just the same sort of body as was on earth. Celsus asks :—

for what kind of body is that which having been destroyed can return to its original nature and to that selfsame condition out of which it fell into dissolution? Having no answer to make, they betake themselves to a most absurd refuge—that everything is possible to God.[1]

Origen's reply to this jibe of Celsus runs into several pages from which we can only find space for a few sentences :—

Neither we nor the Sacred Scriptures say that "those who died long ago rise from the earth and shall live in the same flesh" without that flesh having undergone a change for the better. Celsus calumniates us, when he makes such statements.[2]

He goes on to quote 1 Cor. xv. 35–8 and 42–4.

God gives it a body, as He willed, and to each of the seeds its own body. See how here he [*i.e.* S. Paul] says that it is not the future body that is sown, but that a resurrection, as it were, takes place of that which is sown and cast bare into the ground, God giving to each of the seeds its own body. . . . And we hearken to the Word teaching in many ways the difference there is between that which is sown, as it were, and that which, as it were, rises again from it.[3]

We, therefore, do not maintain that the body which has undergone corruption resumes its original nature, any more than the grain of wheat which has decayed returns to a grain of wheat. For what we do assert is that just as above the grain of wheat is raised up a wheatstalk, so a certain principle lies within the body, from which, since it perishes not, the body is raised up in incorruption.[4]

[1] Origen himself uses almost the same words in his comment on Ps. i. 5, as Celsus in this last sentence, and is quoted with approval by Dean Inge, *The Philosophy of Plotinus*, vol. ii. p. 17. But there Origen is arguing against the gross notions of some uninstructed Christians, who thought that the resurrection meant a resumption of the physical constituents of the body in the same condition as they were at the hour of death. In the answer to Celsus, quoted presently, Origen shows that he considered these notions to be a caricature of the teaching of the Church.

[2] *Cont. Cels.* v. 18, P. G. Tom. 11, p. 1205.

[3] *Ib.* p. 1208.

[4] *Ib.* p. 1216, cf. p. 1203.

An earlier paragraph runs :—

For we also know, that there are bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial, and that the glory of the celestial is one and the glory of the terrestrial is another (1 Cor. xv. 40) ; and that not even is the glory of the celestial bodies the same, for there is one glory of the sun, another of the stars, and amongst the stars themselves star differs from star in glory (xv. 41). And therefore expecting, as we do, the resurrection of the dead, we declare that a change takes place in the qualities of the bodies [quoting 1 Cor. xv. 42–44]. All of us who believe in Divine Providence maintain that the underlying stuff of the body is capable of receiving whatever conditions the Creator wills ; and, since it is the will of God, that the conditions governing this material now are of such and such a kind, but afterwards will be of another sort, so to speak—different and better.[1]

Keeping strictly to the one point, you have here a fair sample of Origen's method of dealing with Celsus. Reason, knowledge of philosophy, and Scripture are the three strings to his bow.

Like S. Augustine after him, he has occasion again and again to return to the subject. So a few excerpts from other works of his are needful to give a complete picture of Origen's teaching, delivered at different periods of his life. His book, *On First Principles,* contains most of the points on which his critics attacked him, and particularly on this very subject of the resurrection of the body. Yet here is a specimen passage :—

Some take offence at the creed of the Church, as if our belief in the resurrection were foolish and absolutely senseless ; heretics especially do so, whom I think we should answer in this fashion. If they themselves admit that there is a resurrection of the dead, let them answer us this question. What is it that died ? Was it not the body ? It is of the body, then, that there will be a resurrection. Then let them say whether they think we shall have bodies or not. I think that since the Apostle Paul says, *It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body*, they cannot deny that the body rises again, or that at the resurrection we are to have bodies. What then ? If it is certain that we

[1] *Cont. Cels.* iv. 57, P. G. Tom. 11, pp. 1121–3.

are to have bodies, and if the bodies that have fallen are declared to rise up again (for only that which has fallen can properly be said to rise up again), no one therefore can doubt that they rise up again, in order that we may be clothed with them a second time after the resurrection. The one thing therefore depends on the other. For if bodies rise up again they undoubtedly rise up to be a covering for us. And if it is necessary that we be in bodies, as it certainly is necessary, we ought to be in no other bodies than our own. But if it is true that these rise up again and that they arise spiritual bodies, there can be no doubt that it is after casting off corruption and laying aside mortality they are said to rise up again from the dead; otherwise it will seem vain and superfluous for any one to rise from the dead only to die again. And this, finally, can be understood to be so, if one were carefully to consider what are the qualities of that natural body, which after it has been sown in the earth takes to itself the qualities of a spiritual body. For it is out of the natural body that the proper strength and grace of the resurrection educes the spiritual body, when it transmutes it from dishonour unto glory.[1]

Having established against certain heretics the identity between our present and our future bodies, he turns to some within the Church, who thought that the identity must be gross and physical to be real :—

We now turn our attention to some of our own people who either from weakness of intellect or lack of proper explanation bring forward a very mean and abject view of the resurrection of the body. We ask them in what manner do they understand that the natural body must be changed by the grace of the resurrection and become a spiritual body; and how do they think that *that which was sown in weakness is raised in power*, etc. (1 Cor. xv. 42–4). Because if they believe the Apostle that a body which arises in glory and power and incorruptibility has already become a spiritual body, it seems absurd and contrary to the Apostle's meaning that it shall become entangled once more in the passions of flesh and blood, especially since the Apostle distinctly says, *Flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God neither shall corruption inherit incorruption*. How, moreover, do they understand the Apostle's saying, *We shall all be changed?* This transformation is to be looked for according to the order which

[1] *De Princip.* ii. 10, P. G. Tom. 11, pp. 233–4.

we have shown above ; and in that transformation it becomes us to hope for something worthy of Divine grace. And we believe it will take place in the order which the Apostle describes the sowing in the ground of "*a bare grain of corn or of any other fruit*," to which "*God gives a body as it pleases Him*," when the actual grain of corn has died. For in like manner our bodies must be regarded as falling into the earth like that grain ; and that principle, implanted in them, which contains the bodily substance, although the bodies die and decay and are scattered abroad—yet that principle, which is always safe in the substance of the body, at God's word raises them up from the earth, and restores and refashions them, just as that power which is in the grain of wheat restores and constitutes it into a body consisting of stalk and ear, after the death and decay of the grain. And so, for those who shall be worthy to attain the inheritance of the heavenly kingdom, that aforenamed principle for the body's restoration will, from the earthy and natural body, build up again at God's command a spiritual body, fit to dwell in heaven.[1]

An example of Origen's comments on Scripture, bringing in our subject, will interest. The text is S. Matt. xxii. 30 :—

For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven.

Here is part of Origen's summing up :—

I think it is clear from these words, that it is not alone in the matter of not marrying and not giving in marriage that those who are worthy of the resurrection from the dead become as the angels in heaven, but also with regard to the bodies of our humiliation, which are transfigured so that they too become like the bodies of the angels, ethereal, and, as it were, glorious light.

But he goes on to add that these and suchlike speculations are perilous.[2]

Jeremiah xviii. 3 gives occasion to this comment :—

God, the Potter of our bodies and Creator of our frame, is able when it falls or is broken in pieces from whatever cause, to take it up and mould it anew, and to make it a different, a fairer and a better vessel as is pleasing in His sight.[3]

[1] *De Princip.* ii. 10, 3, P. G. Tom. 11, pp. 235–6.
[2] *Comm. in Matt.*, P. G. Tom. 13, pp. 1568–71.
[3] *In Jer. Hom.* xviii. 4, P. G. Tom. 13, p. 469.

The following quotation from a fragment of a lost work, entirely devoted to the resurrection, is given to round off our extracts from Origen, and because it contains clear evidence that he identified our Lord's risen Body with His natural body of the days of His flesh.

For when he [*i.e.* S. Paul] had shown most distinctly that the dead do rise again and had shown for certain that our Saviour rose again with the very body which He assumed from Mary; but as it was still not sufficiently clear how the rest would rise or what sort of a body they would have, he compares our resurrection to seeds that are sown in the earth—to a grain of wheat perchance, which when it has fallen into the earth decays, but the power of that principle which is implanted in its inner marrow, the very power (I repeat) of the principle taking to itself the soil lying at hand, or the moisture of water, a due admixture, moreover, of the air round about it, and a sufficient stimulus of warmth, rises up through Divine power into a body consisting of stalk or of ear. And here is what he says: *What thou sowest is not quickened except first it die. And what thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be* (1 Cor. xv. 37). So this body of ours which falls like a seed into the earth, is likened to that grain of wheat.[1]

Tertullian wrote about 192–212 A.D.—Tertullian wrote at the end of the second and beginning of the third century.[2] Very little is known for certain about the exact circumstances of his life, which was apparently spent partly at Rome but mainly in Carthage, the principal city of his native North Africa. His conversion seems to have occurred when he was in the prime of manhood, in the last decade but one of the second century. He was unlike in this to Origen, who was not only born of Christian parents but had a martyr for the Faith to his father. He was unlike also in being a married man. Both, in spite of their great ability, never advanced beyond the priesthood. They had this further feature in common that both were pioneers. Tertullian is the earliest extant Christian writer in the Latin tongue.[3]

[1] P. G. Tom. 11, p. 93.

[2] For a masterly discussion of the dates of Tertullian's writings, see Monceaux's *Histoire litteraire de l'Afrique chrétienne.*

[3] Victor, Bishop of Rome at the time of Tertullian's conversion, is said

We owe some of our most familiar Christian terms to him, *e.g.* Sacrament, Satisfaction, Free-Will, Trinity, etc. He is the first and not the least distinguished in the long line of Western theologians. Learned undoubtedly he was, as his writings show. His terse, virile, epigrammatic Latin cannot be properly enjoyed in a translation. He is racy and witty for all his austerity. Full of faith and fire and daring he despised moderate counsels. In his ardent hot-headed and somewhat narrow zeal for truth and righteousness he is the typical Puritan. Thinking the Church of his day too timid and cautious in matters of discipline he was attracted by the pretensions of Montanus [1] and his two female satellites, who affected a supernatural degree of spirituality. Montanism, in fact, claimed to be a second and final Pentecost, and the two women claimed that their outpourings were utterances of the Holy Spirit. Montanists professed lives of great moral severity, but, unless their contemporaries slandered them, their lives gravely belied their professions. They continued for a long time to be a disturbing influence in Western Christendom.

It is extremely uncertain how far Tertullian identified himself with the Montanists.[2] Certainly he was not formally excommunicated by the Church, and though some of his later works show the influence of Montanism, mainly in an increase of gloomy rigidity, his writings have always been highly prized, and S. Cyprian, no weakling in matters of

to have been an author, and Apollonius, a martyred Roman Senator of the same period, is said to have addressed a noteworthy defence of the Christian religion to the Senate, but the Latin of neither has survived. An Armenian version, however, of the trial and condemnation of Apollonius was published at Venice in 1874, and translated into English in 1894 by F. C. Conybeare, *Monuments of Early Christianity*. In his examination before the Prefect Apollonius speaks of God "as the Saviour of souls and bodies," p. 46. On the same page he speaks of Christians expecting rewards "after the resurrection." Conybeare's book should be better known in spite of its obvious defects.

[1] See Milman, vol. i. pp. 46 *et seq.*; Cheetham, *Church History, Early Period*, pp. 92 *et seq.*; Pullan, *Early Christianity*, pp. 195–200.

[2] Tertullian himself says in his *Adv. Prax.* 1: "Afterwards [*i.e.* after his *De fug. in Persec*, which approved of the claims of the pseudo-prophetesses] our recognition and defence of the 'Paraclete' separated us from the materialists," his name for orthodox Christians. The superb charity of the Church withheld her from overt action towards her implicitly faithful but openly defiant and provocative son.

faith and discipline, is said to have studied them daily.[1] "Give me the Master," said he. As an unimpeachable witness to the general teaching of the Western Church (whatever may be thought of his personal eccentricities) he is cited with confidence by theologians ancient and modern of all schools of thought. What, then, has he to say concerning the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh?

One of his books is on this very subject, and it begins thus:—

> The resurrection of the dead is the Christians' trust.

He adduces the Pythagorean and Platonic conception of the transmigration[2] of souls as so far a feeling after the truth:—

> They strongly asserted that the soul's renewal was to be in a body, deeming it to be more tolerable to change the quality of the body than to deny it altogether. They at least knocked at the door of truth, although they did not enter. Thus the world, with all its errors, does not ignore the resurrection of the dead.[3]

Tertullian devotes a considerable portion of his book to refuting the opinion that by resurrection is meant conversion or baptism; or that the resurrection takes place immediately on the departure from this life.[4] In the course of this discussion he asserts strongly the identity of the present body with that which is to spring from it at the general resurrection. So strongly is the identity asserted, that if Tertullian's teaching ended here or the rest of the treatise had been lost, as has happened to many ancient books, we should have had a doctrine which would have been open to that charge of gross materialism, which

[1] S. Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.* 53, P. L. Tom. 23, p. 698; cf. his *Ep.* 84 (*d*), 2, Tom. 22, p. 744.

[2] It is extraordinarily interesting to come across this dialectic use of the doctrine of metempsychosis by Tertullian. Contrast Origen's jibe at it, *Cont. Cels.* iv. 30, P. G. Tom. 11, p. 1074. It was still a live issue in the East. Tertullian could afford to philosophise about it, as in the West it had practically died out.

[3] *De Resur. Carn.* 1, P. L. Tom. 2, p. 841.

[4] *Ib.* Chapters 22–42, P. L. Tom. 2, pp. 870–902.

even now is levelled against Tertullian by those who do not take the trouble to ascertain his full teaching. Happily we have the complete treatise and can learn how he understood the identity to be conditioned by the "transformation" which the present body undergoes at the resurrection.

After explaining the transformation promised by S. Paul to those found alive at the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 51–2), he adds :—

Nevertheless, he who has already traversed Hades is likewise destined after the resurrection to experience the transformation. From this circumstance we definitely infer that the flesh will undoubtedly rise again, and that it will, owing to the transformation that will supervene, assume the condition of Angels.[1]

For it is the *works* of the flesh, not its "substance" or essence, which S. Paul condemns (*c.* 46). He speaks, consequently, of the resurrection of that "same substance" (*c.* 48). Discussing 1 Cor. xv. 50, *Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of heaven*, he remarks :—

With good reason, then, flesh and blood by themselves, as we said before, fail to receive the Kingdom of heaven. But since that corruptible [*i.e.* flesh] will have to be swallowed up of incorruptibility, and that mortal [*i.e.* the blood] be swallowed up of immortality, through the transformation which is to follow the resurrection ; it is asserted with good reason that flesh and blood, which have not been transformed and "swallowed up," cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, meaning that they have not yet risen again.[2]

Flesh and blood in some sense cannot be shut out of heaven, he argues—

since Jesus is still seated there at the right hand of the Father, Man yet God ; the last Adam, yet the Word from the beginning ; Flesh and Blood, yet a purer than ours ; the Same both in the substance and the form in which He ascended ; Who shall descend in like guise, as the angels declared ; capable also of being recognised by those who pierced Him. Described as the Mediator between God and man because of the pledge committed to Him by both parties, He keeps, too, in His own Self that

[1] *C.* 42, P. L. Tom. 2, p. 901. [2] *C.* 50, *o. c.* p. 915.

deposit of the flesh which is the earnest and pledge of the sum total (of humanity).[1]

S. Paul's great deliverance on the resurrection of the body in the First Epistle to the Corinthians naturally gives occasion for vigorous writing :—

Let us now see in what body he [S. Paul] asserts the dead will come. And he hastened felicitously to give an illustration, as if some one had put a question of that sort to him. *Thou foolish one,* said he, *that which* thou thyself *sowest is not quickened except it die* (xv. 36). So let it once be made clear from this illustration of the seed that the flesh which is quickened is no other than that very flesh which has died, and the rest will become clear as light, for nothing can be brought into the discussion which is incompatible with the illustration. You are not to think because of the words that follow—*And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be*—that the body which shall rise again is therefore another than that which is sown in death. Otherwise you have fallen away from the analogy. For if it be wheat that is sown in the ground and decays, it does not come forth barley, but the very selfsame grain—the same nature, and sort and form. In a word, whence comes it, if it is not the very same ? For even a decayed thing continues to be its own self, since it is of itself that it is the decay. For does not the Apostle himself suggest the meaning to be attached to the words, when he says : *It is not the future body that is sown, but a bare grain, of wheat perchance or something of that sort, but God giveth it a body as he wills.* Certainly it is to that grain which he speaks of as being sown "bare." Of course, you say. Then the seed is safe enough, to which God has in mind to assign a body. But how can it be safe if it is nowhere in existence, if it does not rise again, if it does not rise its actual self ? If it rises not again it is not safe, and if it is not safe it cannot receive a body from God. For what purpose, then, will God give it a body, seeing that it has already its own proper "bare" body, unless it be in order that in its rising again it may be no longer bare ? That, therefore, which will be placed over it, will be something additional ; nor is that annihilated over which the something additional is placed, rather is it increased. That which receives increase is safe. For it is sown just a bare seed without a haulm to clothe it, without a base for

[1] *C.* 51, *o. c.* p. 916.

the spike, without protection for the ear, without the crowning pride of a stalk. Yet it rises up with copious usury, built up in a compact fabric, fashioned in a fair order, made secure by good husbandry and clothed on every side. These embellishments it has as that other God-given body, into which it is transmuted not by annihilation, but by enlargement. And to each one of the seeds God has assigned its own body, not its own in the sense of its body in its original condition, but its own in order that that, which it gets from God from without itself, may eventually be its very own. Keep close, then, to the analogy and hold it up constantly as a mirror to show what happens to the flesh, in the belief that the same flesh which was sown will spring up fruitfully, the very same, only fuller and more perfect, not another flesh, although it reappears in another guise.[1]

A little further on occurs a passage which though long is worthy of quotation :—

We will therefore proceed to explain more fully the force and the manner of a transformation, which almost raises the presumption, that it is quite a different flesh that will rise again —as if to be transformed meant utterly to cease to be, and to undergo the loss of the original self. But a distinction must be drawn between transformation and any suggestion of annihilation. For transformation is one thing, annihilation is another. But there would be no difference between the two if the flesh will be so transformed as to perish altogether. And annihilated it will be by the transformation, if it shall not remain persistently itself all through that transformation which shall be made evident at the resurrection. For precisely as it perishes if it rises not again, so equally does it perish, if, although it rises again, it is lost on the road to transformation. For it will cease to exist just as much as if it had not risen again at all. And how absurd to rise again, if rising again is merely for the purpose of ceasing to be! Since it could have failed to rise again, and ceased its existence in that way; because it had already entered on its non-existence. Things that are absolutely different—such as transformation and annihilation—will not admit of being confused with one another. The one destroys, the other transforms. So, as a thing that is destroyed is not just changed, in like manner that which is transformed is not destroyed. For a thing to have perished is to cease totally to be what it has been.

[1] *C.* 52, *o. c.* pp. 918–9.

Therefore a thing can be identically the same, even when it exists in another condition, for since it does not perish, it has its existence still. For it is a transformation that it has undergone, not an annihilation. And so a thing can both be transformed and nevertheless remain its very self, just as even in this present life a man may retain complete identity in substance and yet may be transformed in many ways—in habit, in bodily size, in health, and in circumstances, in dignity, in age, inclination, business, means, habitation, laws, and customs—and still lose nothing of his humanity, nor so to be made different that he ceases to be the same man : nay not "be made a different man," but another thing. To this kind of transformation (which we have been postulating) the Holy Scriptures too bear witness. . . . The Lord also in the retirement of the Mount had exchanged his earthly raiment for a robe of light, yet He had retained His features so that they were recognisable by Peter (Matt. xvii. 2-4). And in that spot Moses and Elijah, the one in the semblance of that risen life which he had not yet attained, the other in the reality of that which had not died, had shown that the state of bodily existence may continue identical even in glory. And Paul, too, instructed by this example, said: *Who will fashion anew the body of our humiliation and make it like unto His own Body of glory* (Phil. iii. 21). But if you maintain that transfiguration and change amount to the disappearance of any substantial identity whatever, in that case Saul when *he was changed to another man* (1 Sam. x. 6) departed out of his own body ; and Satan himself when he is *transformed into an angel of light* (2 Cor. xi. 14) loses his own proper condition ! I do not think so. So likewise in effecting the resurrection, transformations, changes, refashionings will take place, yet substantial identity be preserved intact.[1]

It is very tempting to give more extracts from other works of Tertullian, but we must content ourselves with a single pregnant sentence from the last chapter of the treatise *On the Resurrection* :—

And so the flesh will rise again wholly complete, absolutely identical, and entirely unimpaired.[2]

It will be seen that after vindicating in the clearest fashion the principle of transformation, Tertullian returns

[1] *C.* 55, *o. c.* pp. 923–5. [2] *C.* 73, *o. c.* p. 934.

to the principle of identity as the foundation truth regarding the resurrection of the body.

We have treated of the teaching of Origen and Tertullian at unusual length for this reason amongst others, that they set the fashion which East and West have followed since their day. Origen and the East after him lay the emphasis on the transformation of the resurrection body, whilst definitely asserting the identity; Tertullian and the West following his example reverse matters and stress the identity, while at the same time, as we have seen Tertullian [1] do, admitting that the risen body has undergone a tremendous change. The West was more concerned with the moral significance of the resurrection of the body, and consequently emphasised the identity of the body, which had been concerned in the acts to be judged, with the body that is to present itself for judgment.

The only other Latin writers,[2] until the age of Constantine, who treat at any length of the resurrection of the body are Minucius Felix and Lactantius, and it will be convenient to introduce them at this point.

Minucius Felix, Latter Half of Second or First Half of Third Century.—The exact date of Minucius Felix is

[1] The criticism of Tertullian's teaching by Dean Inge (*Phil. of Plot.* vol. ii. p. 16) is highly significant. Tertullian shared with some early Christian writers the Stoic doctrine that the soul has a certain corporeity of its own, just as they supposed the angels to have bodies of a sort peculiar to themselves. This opinion, which indeed remained an opinion, the Dean dubs as "frankly materialistic," and omits to mention that Tertullian quotes the Stoics and other eminent philosophers, among them Aristotle, for this philosophic opinion, and never exalts it to the rank of a Christian doctrine. But the Platonists rejected the speculation—it may be rightly. *Hinc illæ lacrimæ.* Then the Dean ascribes to Tertullian the "real conviction that the soul dies with the body and that both are raised again by miracle at the last day," and represents the most fearless of men as advancing this theory by means of a "vague phrase," which is meant to cover his "real conviction." The Dean supports this suggestion by quoting two short sentences from the treatise *On the Soul* (*c.* 7), without giving them in their proper order, and overlooking the fact that Tertullian is dealing there with an entirely different question. He is disproving an opinion held by some of the pagans that until burial a portion of the soul stayed behind with the body. Acquaintance with Tertullian's general teaching should save any one from the hasty misunderstanding which attributes such a conviction to him.

[2] Cyprian, one of the most considerable and authoritative of the Latin authors of this period, does not discuss the question in any of his extant writings. Some beautiful words of his by way of consolation to mourners will be found in *De Mort.* xx. xxvi. P. L. Tom. 3, pp. 618–24.

uncertain, but he is earlier than the earliest [1] (A.D. 246) work of S. Cyprian, which incorporates whole passages from him. He wrote a charming little Dialogue (*Octavius*) in graceful Latin in defence of Christianity. In the course of the debate with his two friends, of which the Dialogue is a record, he speaks thus of the resurrection of the body :—

According to Pythagoras and Plato, the most distinguished of the Philosophers, after the dissolution of the body it is only the soul that abides for ever, and it often passes into fresh bodies. A further distortion of the truth is that the souls of men return to the bodies of cattle, birds, and beasts. Such an idea deserves a comedian's ridicule rather than the serious consideration of a philosopher. However, in view of the subject before us, it is enough that your philosophers agree with us to a certain extent. Besides, who is so foolish or so stupid as to venture to deny the statements that as man could originally be made by God, so he can afterwards be re-made by Him ; that man is nothing after death, and was nothing before his birth ; that as he could be born from nothing, so can he be re-fashioned from nothing ? Moreover it is more difficult to bring into existence that which is not, than to renew that which has been. Do you think that if a thing is withdrawn from our dull eyes, it has perished from God's sight ? All bodies, whether they become dry dust or are resolved into moisture or become a handful of ashes, or a puff of smoke, are lost to our observation, but are stored up by God, the guardian of their elements. Nor are we, as you imagine, afraid of any injury from the mode of burial, though we practise the old and better custom of inhumation.[2]

Observe how, as a consolation for us, all nature broods over (the thought of) a future resurrection. The sun sets and rises again, the stars disappear and come again, the flowers die and live again, after decay the trees sprout again, seeds put forth fresh life only after dying. So the body in the tomb is as trees in winter : they hide their vitality under an assumption of dryness. Why are you in a hurry for their revival and return during the cruel winter ? Nor am I unaware that most men,

[1] Cf. *Quod Idola Dii non sint*, P. L. Tom. 4, pp. 586–603.

[2] Christians did not practise cremation, but this did not arise from any fear of harm to the resurrection body through cremation. This is clear from *Mart. Polycarp.* 18 ; Tertullian, *De An.* 51 ; *De resurr. Carn.* 63 ; Origen, *Cont. Cels.* v. 23, viii. 30 ; Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* vi. 12 ; Eusebius *H. E.* v. 2, viii. 22 ; Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, i. 12, 13.

conscious of their demerits, hope for rather than believe in non-existence after death: for they prefer total extinction to resurrection with punishment to follow.[1]

Lactantius wrote at Beginning of Fourth Century.—Lactantius, originally a distinguished advocate and teacher of rhetoric, became a Christian some time before the close of the third century and lived until about the time of the Nicene Council. He was a prolific writer. His works which have come down to us show him to have been a man of vast erudition. They are written in so eloquent and dignified a style that he has been called the Christian Cicero. He was tutor to the Emperor Constantine's son, Crispus.

He touches on the resurrection here and there in *The Divine Institutes*, but the following passages are culled from the seventh book only of that work, entitled *On the Happy Life*:—

For God will come [he writes] in order that when He has cleansed the world from all stain He may restore to life the souls of the just, having renewed their bodies, and raise them to everlasting felicity.[2]

Therefore they will not be born over again, a thing that cannot be, but they will rise again and be clothed with bodies by God, and they will remember their former life and all their doings; and, placed in heavenly regions, and enjoying the pleasure of countless resources, they will offer thanksgiving unto God present among them, for that He has destroyed every evil thing and raised them up to a Kingdom and to everlasting life.[3]

Thus he writes of the resurrection of the righteous, having already described the doom of the wicked in these terms:—

But the Holy Scriptures teach us the manner after which the impious will undergo punishment. For because they have committed sins in their bodies, they will be again clothed with flesh in order that they may pay the penalty in their bodies; and it will not be that flesh with which God clothed man, like this our earthly body, but indestructible and lasting for ever.[4] . . .

[1] *Octav.* 34, Halm's *Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.* vol. ii. pp. 48–9. J. H. Freese's *Minucius Felix*, in S.P.C.K.'s *Translations of Christian Literature*, is admirably done and should be read in full.

[2] *Div. Instit.* vii. 22, P. L. Tom. 6, p. 804.

[3] *Ib.* 23, P. L. Tom. 6, p. 806.

[4] *Ib.* 21, P. L. Tom. 6, p. 801.

CHAPTER VIII

EARLY CHURCH TEACHING OUTSIDE THE ROMAN EMPIRE

APHRAATES, "The Persian Sage," wrote 336–345.—This seems to be the place to present the testimony of Aphraates, the only writer outside the Roman Empire that will claim our attention at any length. It will be necessary to give a brief sketch of his life and writings as he is not so well known as he ought to be to English readers.

The rescue of his writings from oblivion is one of the literary romances of the later nineteenth century. His works never had currency in the Latin or Greek world, as from the first he was overshadowed by his younger contemporary, S. Ephrem Syrus.[1] The single reference to them in Gennadius of Marseilles (496) shows that he only knew of him by hearsay, probably from his friend Cassian, himself an Eastern, a traveller, and well-informed. Gennadius gives a list of the Tractates of Aphraates, confused indeed, but unmistakably referring to those now brought to light. But he attributes the authorship to S. Jacob of Nisibis, who had died in 338, seven years before the Tractates were completed. The cause of the confusion, which is found also in the Armenian MSS. of an early translation into that tongue,[2] arose from the adoption by Aphraates of the Christian name Jacob[3] either at his baptism, his profession of the Ascetic Life, or on his elevation to the Episcopate. But, though unrecognised by Greek and Latin writers, amongst his own

[1] As S. Ephrem was from the first in touch with Græco-Roman Church life and theology, his witness has not the independence of the archaic Aphraates. Doubtless all this will be brought out in Dr. Burkitt's expected book on the Saint.

[2] Antonelli, *S. Patris nostri Jacobi, Ep. Nes. Sermones*, published 1756.

[3] Gennadius, *De Script. Eccl. c.* 1, P. L. Tom. 58, pp. 1060–2.

countrymen he was held in high esteem, being known as the Persian Sage. We can trace their knowledge of his works down to the fourteenth century. In addition to the translation into Armenian, the Abyssinian Church had the works in her own tongue.[1]

But all trace of the original Syriac had been lost for five or six hundred years even amongst his own people, until the fortunate discovery of two MSS., one dated 474 and the other 510. They were found amongst a quantity of priceless documents which were acquired for the British Museum between the years 1838–1851 from the Monastery of S. Mary in the Nitrian valley of Lower Egypt. W. Cureton, the discoverer, announced the find in 1858 in the preface to his recension of the Gospels from another of these MSS. He promised to print the Syriac text of Aphraates, but that great service to scholarship was carried out by his distinguished pupil, W. Wright, in 1869, under the title, *The Homilies* [2] *of Aphraates the Persian Sage.*

It is not to the credit of English scholarship that in the intervening half-century since Wright's premier edition, the exploitation of this valuable discovery has been left to foreign scholars, French and German. A list is given below of the principal publications on the subject.[3]

Until Mr. Danby's expected volume appears we have no worthy treatment in an English book of the questions raised by this addition to our knowledge of the late third and early fourth centuries. Consequently before Aphraates' teaching on the resurrection can be properly understood, it will be necessary to say something of the man and his works, and that at greater length than can be spared for better known men.

Aphraates is the Melchizedek of early Church writers. The circumstances of his birth and death are alike unknown. Whatever is known of his life has to be gathered by inferences

[1] The fifth Tractate in the Ethiopic version is in the National Library at Paris. See Fotenberg's Catalogue, p. 248, *c.* 2, quoted by Dom Parisot.

[2] It is generally recognised that "Homilies" is not a happy rendering of the original title. They are not discourses, but hortatory and exegetic disquisitions, thrown into the form of letters to an inquiring friend. Perhaps Tractates will describe them best.

[3] See at end of chapter.

from incidental statements in his writings. These consist of twenty-three carefully dated Tractates; 1–10 written 336–7; 11–22 in 344; and 23 in 345. The first twenty-two begin with the corresponding letters of the Syriac alphabet. He took pains that not only their date but their order should be known. They are practical in their outlook and are more concerned with Christian life than with the formulation of Christian belief.

We gather from them that he was a subject of the great Persian Empire, which was strong enough to contend on equal terms with Rome, and to give and take severe blows. In Aphraates' young days (297) the Persian Empire [1] had lost to Rome the five Provinces, which lay between the Euphrates and the Tigris—Mesopotamia proper—but still extended from the Persian Gulf in the south to the Armenian mountains on the north, with the Tigris as its western and the Kurdistan highlands as its eastern boundaries. The city of Seleucia—Ctesiphon on the Tigris—was the capital and had over half a million inhabitants. Not many years after Aphraates' death the five lost provinces were recovered (363), Sapor II., the Shah-in-Shah,[2] whose reign of seventy years is a record in reigns, having inflicted on the Roman Empire one of the most ignoble reverses which it ever sustained.[3]

The constant state of war or preparation for war between the two Empires shut off the Church in the Persian Empire from free intercourse with the centres of religious life and thought in the Græco-Roman world. It is this very fact which makes the works of Aphraates of such abounding interest. They are the product of an independent indigenous [4] Church, which was soon to become involved in the

[1] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury, vol. i. pp. 324–5.

[2] *I.e.* King of Kings.

[3] Gibbon, *op. cit.* vol. ii. *ad fin.* The irony of history is well exemplified here. Sapor, the relentless persecutor of Christianity during the latter half of his reign (*v.* Duval, *Anc. Lit. Chr.: La Littérature Syriaque*, pp. 129 *sq.*), rid the Roman Empire of an equally relentless persecutor in the person of the apostate Julian, who fell in that fateful battle of June 26, 363.

[4] There were "Parthians and Medes and Elamites and dwellers in Mesopotamia" present in Jerusalem at the first Pentecost (Acts ii. 9).

controversies of the Roman Empire, but in Aphraates' time was entirely free of them. Hence the unique importance of his witness to the general Christian tradition.

As a subject, then, of that proud, secluded Empire Aphraates lived and died. We gather that he was of heathen parentage.[1] The conjecture is hazarded that he entered the Church through the Synagogue, and had begun his minute knowledge of the Old Testament and acquired the Rabbinic [2] tinge of his interpretation of it in one of the admirable Jewish academies which flourished in the Persian Empire before and at this time. Ever since the Captivity of a thousand years before, there had existed a large Jewish community in Mesopotamia, which had become rich and powerful. The chief, the so-called "Prince of the Exile," was fourth in rank after the Shah himself.[3]

Aphraates says not a word about the circumstances of his conversion. He embraced the Ascetic [4] Life, and became a Bishop; and possibly the tradition that his see was the Metropolitical one of Nineveh—now Mosul—is correct.[5] The connection of his name with the Monastery of Mar Mattai outside Nineveh, which can hardly have existed as a Monastery proper in his lifetime, may be a reminiscence of the fact that the Community there was the lineal descendant of the band of Ascetics which gathered

The recently discovered work of Msiha-Zkha, *The History of the Bishops of Adiabene*, shows that the story of Addai, the early founder of the Church in Persia, has more substance than had been generally acknowledged. Addai consecrated the Bishop Pqida in 104. See *Sources Syriaques*, ed. Mingana, vol. i. H. L. Pass's late date for the introduction of Christianity into Persia (*J. T. S.* vol. ix. p. 278, six lines from bottom) needs reconsideration.

[1] *Patrologia Syriaca, Dem.* xvi. 7; xvii. 8.

[2] Cf. Funk, *Die Hagadischen Elemente in den Homilien des Aphraates.*

[3] Labourt, *Le Christianisme Dans L'Empire Perse*, p. 8.

[4] It is very unlikely that monasteries proper existed in Persia in the time of Aphraates. Those who were accepted by the Church as professed Ascetics may have remained in their own homes, or attached themselves to the Bishop's residence. At all events, Aphraates' maxims to his own Ascetics do not indicate strict seclusion. *E.g.*—

Let us visit our Lord in the persons of His sick (*Dem.* vi. 1).

[5] All that can be extracted from his Tractates bearing on his persona history is worked out carefully by Dr. Gwynn, *Post-Nicene Fathers, New Series*, vol. xiii. pp. 56–8; and in fuller detail and more fully documented by Dom Parisot in Graffin's *Patr. Syr.* pp. ix.–xxi.

round him as Bishop.[1] Be that as it may, the exact details of his life must remain obscure. They would be mainly of interest because of the light which they might have thrown on his works.

In his extant writings Aphraates quotes no Christian book except the Bible. The only heresies he speaks of are those [2] of Marcion, Valentinus, and his countryman, Mani, already a century and more old.

Though he wrote his first Tractate eleven and his last twenty years after the Nicene Council he betrays no knowledge of that great assembly, nor even of the controversies that led up to it. His theology is of a period before the great questions which engaged the Council's attention had so much as arisen. So, though chronologically he belongs to the first half of the fourth century, theologically he is of the early third. The Church in the Persian Empire of his day was auto-cephalous and not connected up with either Antioch,[3] Jerusalem, Alexandria, Constantinople, or Rome.

There is not the slightest ground for believing that Aphraates would have rejected the Nicene expression of the Christian tradition.[4] In his first Tractate he declares certain things to be "the Faith of the Church of God" (i. 19). He distinctly states that he wrote:—

> not according to the opinion of any one man, nor for the convincing of (merely) a single reader, but according to the mind of the whole Church and to convince (his readers) of the universal Faith.[5]

[1] *Dem.* vi. 4, 6, 8, 20; vii. 25; xviii. 12; *et al.*

[2] *Dem.* iii. 9.

[3] There seems no foundation for the story of later Syriac historians that a predecessor of the first Katholikos, Papa, had gone to Antioch for consecration, and failing there had been consecrated at Jerusalem; cf. Wigram, *The Assyrian Church*, p. 41.

[4] The latter part of Tractate XVII., which follows his confession of our Lord's Godhead, is well vindicated by H. L. Pass in the Article cited in the bibliography at the end of the chapter. Part of the truth is that it is an amplification of the *ad hominem* argument of John x. 33–8. The confession itself has the true ring about it:—

> We hold Jesus our Lord to be God, the Son of God, King, the King's Son, Light from Light, Creator. . . . By many names He is called, but leaving the rest, let us proclaim Him to be God, yea God Himself who came forth from God (*Dem.* xvii. 2).

[5] *Dem.* xxii. 26; cf. v. 25.

He speaks of having learnt from Teachers, but gives no name.[1] Above all he describes himself most justly as "a disciple of the Holy Scriptures."[2] Abundant quotation from Holy Scripture is a feature of all early Christian writers. Aphraates follows this settled usage to the dislocation of his literary style. He is not content to give one or two apposite quotations to prove or to illustrate his point. He proceeds remorselessly through the whole Bible and adduces every text even remotely bearing on his subject. The consequent prolixity can be very tedious to the general reader, but it is of inestimable value as evidence of the text current in his primitive community.[3]

This reverence for and constant reliance on Scripture make all the more improbable Dr. Burkitt's hasty ascription to Aphraates of so palpably unscriptural a notion as the restriction[4] to celibates of Holy Baptism.

Following S. Paul[5] (1 Cor. vii. 35–40), Aphraates gives pride of place to Virginity over Marriage, and writing as an Ascetic to an Ascetic and for Ascetics he makes much of their common vocation. Dr. Burkitt's strong dissent[6]

[1] *Dem.* ii. 14; cf. his advice to his inquiring friend, *Dem.* i. 20; xii. 12.

[2] *Dem.* xxii. 26, *ad fin.*; cf. *Dem.* v. 8, and xiv. 47.

[3] It also shows the books contained in his Bible. He quotes all the Canonical books of the Old Testament with the exception of Nehemiah and Obadiah, which contained nothing to his purpose. It is also doubtful if he refers to The Song of Songs in *Dem.* vi. 19. Of the Deutero-canonical books he quotes 1 and 2 Maccabees and Tobit, and refers twice or thrice to Ecclesiasticus and possibly once to Wisdom (*Dem.* xiv. 45). He quotes all the books of the New Testament with the exceptions of 2 Thess., Titus, Philemon, James, 1 and 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and also Revelation. But cf. "the Second Death" (*Dem.* vii. 25; viii. 19), though as this expression occurs in the Targumists, it may be a reminiscence of the Jewish Schools and not derived from Rev. xx. 6. The four Gospels are mostly quoted from the Diatessaron of Tatian, which was composed in Syriac, his own medium.

[4] "In Aphraates, Baptism is not the common seal of every Christian's faith, but a privilege reserved for celibates," *Early Eastern Christianity*, pp. 125 *sq.* "The deliberate reservation of Baptism for the spiritual aristocracy of Christendom," etc. (*ib.* p. 126).

[5] Cf. Matt. xix. 12, 29; Mark x. 29, 30; Luke xviii. 29, 30; Acts xxi. 9; Rev. xiv. 4.

[6] The Persian Sage ought to feel consoled that a much greater than he fares no better. S. Luke is made to teach:—

"that those that are worthy to attain the resurrection from the dead do not marry like the ordinary inhabitants of the world"

(*ib.* p. 120). S. Luke xx. 34–5 is quoted for this statement. For the first

from S. Paul and Aphraates on this point seems to have affected his usually sound judgment and led him completely to misunderstand a passage in Tractate VII. 20.

When Aphraates exalts Virginity, he must not be understood to depreciate Marriage as the usual vocation of the majority of Christians. So far from disparaging Marriage, he is emphatic on its sacredness :—

Upon Matrimony, which was given to the world by God, we cast no slur, God forbid.[1]

What Dr. Burkitt takes as slurs on Matrimony itself are simply the warnings of the practical man, which Aphraates eminently was, that young people proposing to adopt the Ascetic Life should weigh well what " the contest " involves, and not cause scandal afterwards by finding the obligations [2] undertaken too much for them. The Church authorities, according to him, are not lightly to accept every aspirant to the dedicated life. The scrutiny is to be so strict that it is compared to Gideon's acceptance of only three hundred out of the ten thousand volunteers [3] (Judges vii. 7). Aphraates, in another connection, lays stress on the point that the Ascetic Life is a matter of personal choice, not of universal Christian obligation :—

A great reward is in store for that state, because we observe it of our own free-will, and not through subjection to the restraint of a commandment, and we are bound therein under no law.[4]

time in Christian history S. Luke's words have been understood of life in this world, unless the unenviable priority should be assigned to F. C. Conybeare, *Monuments of Early Christianity*, pp. 23–4. It is sincerely to be hoped that when a new edition of these fascinating Lectures is called for, Dr. Burkitt, who has done so much good work in popularising Syriac studies, will correct these oversights. They are unworthy of the author of *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*. The identification of B'nai Q'yama (*i.e.* the sons of the Pact or Rule, the professed Ascetics) with the general body of Christians (*ib.* pp. 132 *sq.*) is quite untenable.

[1] *Dem.* xviii. 8.

[2] *Dem.* vii. 18 : He that hath betrothed a wife and wisheth to take her, let him return and rejoice with his wife. . . . It is for Ascetics that the contest is fitting.

[3] *Dem.* vii. 21. The delicious little bit about the fidelity of the dog to his master, which the Ascetics are to imitate, *may* be derived from Origen (*Hom.* ix. *in Jud.*), as Dom Connolly suggests (*J. T. S.* vi. p. 539), but is much more likely to have been a commonplace of the Ascetic movement of the third and fourth centuries ; *cf.* the *Domini canes* of a later movement, which was not consciously derived from Origen or Aphraates.

[4] *Dem.* xviii. 12 ; cf. xiv. 20, " offered themselves."

And if there is any further room for doubt as to Aphraates' attitude on the subject, we need only look at the so-called "Creed" of the first Tractate.[1] Its list of the *agenda et vitanda* of the Christian life contains no reference whatever to celibacy or any other obligation of the Ascetic Life; and its mention of "adultery" as well as of "fornication" as possible crimes in Christians implies that Marriage will be the vocation of most of the Christian people.

The long and short of it is that S. Paul and Aphraates consider the virgin life to be a higher calling than the married life, when the contrasted vocations are regarded by themselves, and, as it were, *in vacuo*. Both would readily agree that that, to which the individual is called, is the higher for her or him.

We seem to have wandered a long way off from our own immediate subject, but only in appearance, for whilst Aphraates places "the resurrection of the dead" amongst the *credenda*,[2] and refers to it elsewhere in his Tractates, his strange speculations as to the manner of it would restrict a happy resurrection to the baptised. So if only celibates were to be baptised a happy resurrection would be confined to that select few.

Dr. Burkitt does not himself dwell unduly[3] on this inevitable moral from his misreading of Aphraates, but the inference is drawn boldly on his authority by a writer in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*.[4] Consequently it was necessary to show that Dr. Burkitt's interpretation of Aphraates' doctrine concerning baptism is

[1] *Dem.* i. 19, which closes thus:—

These are the works of faith that is founded on the firm rock, which is Christ, upon Whom the whole building is built.

[2] *Dem.* i. 19.

[3] But see on p. 153 of *Early Eastern Christianity*:—

"strict continence is the way to secure the physical efficiency of Baptism for a good resurrection at the last day."

[4] "Burkitt has shown that in early Syriac Christianity the sacrament of baptism was believed to have a special efficacy in relation to complete physical resurrection, and was limited to celibates":

Dict. Apost. Church, vol. ii. p. 326. This whole article contrasts very unfavourably with that which follows it on the Resurrection of Christ—a weighty contribution to the subject.

untenable, before dealing with the Sage's conception of the resurrection of the body.

His inclusion of "the resurrection of the dead" in the fragmentary "Creed" of his first Tractate (*Dem.* i. 19) has been already mentioned. He devotes his eighth Tractate entirely, and his twenty-second partly, to an explication of the doctrine. His view seems in some respects to be peculiar to himself, and to be derived directly from his reading of Holy Scripture. An analysis of Tractate VIII., giving his own words, but abbreviating his catena of quotations, will be the fairest way of enabling the reader to judge for himself.

SECTION 1.—Men constantly inquire controversially, *how the dead shall rise and with what body shall they come?* For the body wears out and is destroyed, and the bones, as time goes on, crumble and are not to be recognised. And if you should enter a tomb where a hundred men have been buried, you would find there—not a handful of dust. And those who ponder on such things say thus: "We know of course that the dead shall rise again, but they will put on a 'celestial body' and spiritual forms. For if it is not so, these hundred dead that were buried in one tomb, of whom after a long space of time nothing at all remains there—when the dead shall be quickened and shall put on a body and rise again, from whence shall the body come, unless it be that they will put on a 'celestial body'? For behold! there is nothing in the tomb."

SECTION 2.—Whoever argues thus is a foolish and ignorant man. True, when the dead were put in the tomb, they were something, and when they were there a long time, they became nothing. But when the time of the resurrection of the dead comes, that nothing shall become something, after the fashion of its original nature, and to that nature a change [1] will be added. O thou unwise man, who arguest in that way, hear what the blessed Apostle says, instructing such another foolish one as thyself [and he quotes in full 1 Cor. xv. 36–8].

SECTION 3.—Learn from this, therefore, foolish one, that each of the seeds is clothed with its own body; you never sow wheat and reap barley; you do not plant a vine, and it produce figs; but everything grows according to its own nature. The body

[1] Note the identity of the resurrection body, and yet its change.

which was laid in the earth will rise up the same again. And as to the body becoming corrupt and wasting away, you should learn from the parable of the seed. The seed, when cast into the ground, decays and is dissolved; yet from its very decay it grows, and buds, and bears fruit. For if no seed be cast into ploughed land, no fruit is produced, even if that land drinks in ever so much rain. So from the grave in which no men are buried shall no men come forth at the resurrection of the dead, sound the full voice of the trumpet ever so loudly. But if, as men say, the spirits of the righteous ascend up into heaven and put on a "celestial body,"[1] they naturally remain in heaven. And so likewise does our Quickener dwell in heaven. In that case, who will there be for Him to raise from the dead when our Saviour shall come again? And why did (the Evangelist) write for us: *The hour shall come and now is, that the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and shall live and come forth from their tombs* (John v. 25, 28, 29). It cannot be that the "celestial body" shall come to enter into the tomb and come forth again.

SECTION 4.—For those foolish ones say: Why does the Apostle say *the "celestial body" is one thing, the terrestrial another* (1 Cor. xv. 40)? But he who quotes this let him observe what further the Apostle says: *There is an animal (natural) body and there is a spiritual body* (1 Cor. xv. 44). He says also: *We shall all sleep, but we shall not*[2] *all be changed* (1 Cor. xv. 51). (Aphraates quotes 1 Cor. xv. 53, xv. 29, xv. 32–3, xv. 13–15.) Therefore if the dead rise not, there is no judgment. And if there is no judgment, then *let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die* (1 Cor. xv. 32–3). Now as to this that the Apostle said, *The "celestial body" is different from the terrestrial body*, let that sentence be understood by thee thus: when the body of the righteous shall arise and be

[1] Note what Aphraates is opposing here. It is just that theory which has a certain limited vogue at the present day, viz. that the resurrection of each person takes place at death. His argument against it is, that it renders otiose all the plain Scripture teaching about the general resurrection at the winding up of the present dispensation. And indeed those who resolve the resurrection into an immediate assumption into heaven at death are consistent in cutting out the general resurrection and the judgment, though those articles of belief are compact of the living tissue of the New Testament.

[2] *Sic.* This reading is given in a number of uncial Greek MSS., the Latin vulgate, Ethiopic and Armenian versions, and in some Greek and all Latin Fathers with the possible exception of Tertullian. Nevertheless, the less well attested reading is accepted by Westcott and Hort (as in both A.V. and R.V.) and by most modern editors. It is found in B; the Syriac, Memphitic, and Gothic versions; and in many Greek Fathers. See Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in Greek*, vol. ii. 118.

transformed, it is called a "celestial body"; and that which is not changed is termed "terrestrial" according to its earthy nature.

SECTION 5.—But hear, my friend, another saying like unto this: 1 Cor. ii. 15; Rom. viii. 5, vii. 5, viii. 9. The Apostle spoke all these sayings whilst still clothed in the flesh, yet he was doing the works of the Spirit. So likewise at the resurrection of the dead the righteous shall be transformed, and the earthly form, having been swallowed up by the heavenly, shall be termed a "celestial body"; but the body (of the wicked) which is not transformed shall be called earthy.

SECTIONS 6, 7, 8, 9 (summarised).—Concerning this resurrection of the dead I will instruct thee to the best of my ability.

He instances Adam's creation from nothing as an assurance that God will do the less difficult thing of raising him from the dead. All our fathers were looking forward to the resurrection (Heb. ix. 15, 16). Jacob showed that by his desire to be buried with his fathers (Gen. xlix. 29, 31). So did Joseph when he bound his brothers by an oath to carry up his bones with them (Gen. l. 25). Moses shows that Jacob in his last blessing wished to absolve Reuben from his offence, that his son might share in the resurrection: *Reuben shall live and not die and shall be in the number* (Deut. xxxiii. 6). Moses himself wished to go and be buried with his fathers (Deut. xxxiv. 1–5) that they all might rise together at the resurrection.

SECTION 10.—And Moses again proclaimed clearly the resurrection of the dead, for he said as from the mouth of God: *I kill and I make alive* [1] (Deut. xxxii. 39). Isaiah the prophet in like manner said: *Thy dead men shall live, O Lord, and their dead bodies shall arise* (Isa. xxvi. 19).

SECTIONS 11 and 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 (summarised).—Not only did God speak of bringing the dead to life, but He declared the same by deeds. Elijah raised the son of the widow, Elisha the Shunammite's son, and at the touch of Elisha's bones a dead man returned to life. Ezekiel

[1] A typical example of an interpretation derived from the Jewish Rabbis; cf. Sanh. 91*b*; Pes. 68*a*. Tos. Sanh. xiii. 3 explains also 1 Sam. ii. 6 (The Lord killeth and maketh alive) eschatologically.

prophesied of the raising to life in the valley full of bones. Elijah and Elisha prevailed in answer to many prayers and supplications, but by His word Christ, who is the WORD, raised Jairus' daughter, the widow's only son, and Lazarus. One word from Him will suffice to rouse the dead.

Also He explained the resurrection to the Sadducees, when they tried to entangle Him with the story of the woman who had had seven husbands.

SECTIONS 17 and 18.—There are persons, who though they are alive, yet are dead unto God :—

In laying His command on Adam, He told him : *In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die* (Gen. ii. 17). Though Adam lived 930 years after he had transgressed the commandment and had eaten, he was accounted dead unto God, because of his sins. But that you may be assured that a sinner is called dead though he is actually alive,[1] I will show you ; for in the prophet Ezekiel it is written : *As I live, saith the Lord of lords, I take no pleasure in the death of a dead sinner* (xviii. 23, 32 ; xxxiii. 11).

SECTION 18.—He proceeds to quote our Lord's reply to the inquirer, who wanted to bury his father before following the call : *Let the dead bury their dead* (Luke ix. 59, 60), to show that sinners though alive are spoken of as dead in God's sight. And similarly the death of the righteous is regarded as a sleep from which they are to be awaked, instancing Psalm iii. 5, *I laid me down and slept and rose up again ;* Isa. xxvi. 19, *they that lie in the dust shall awake ;* Matt. ix. 24, *the maid is not dead, but sleepeth ;* John xi. 11, *our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go to awake him out of sleep ;* 1 Cor. xv. 51, *we shall all sleep, but we shall not all be changed ;* and 1 Thess. iv. 13, *sorrow not for them that are asleep.*

This insistence of Aphraates on the death of the righteous as a sleep will account for a feature of his teaching to be noticed presently, viz. that the time between death and resurrection is spent in a dream state. It will also save his use of the expression " second death " in the next section from chiliastic taint. To Aphraates the state of sin is death ;

[1] Another Rabbinic idea ; cf. the Talmudic saying :—
" the wicked are spoken of (in Scripture) as dead, though alive."

repentance, conversion, baptism, form the first resurrection ; the rising again at the end of this age is the second resurrection for the righteous, just as for the wicked it constitutes the " second death."

SECTION 19.—But it is of the " second death " [1] that it is right for us to be afraid—that which is full of weeping and gnashing of teeth, of groanings and miseries, that which is situated in outer darkness. But blessed shall be the faithful and righteous in that resurrection, in which they expect to be awakened and to receive the good promises made to them. As for the wicked who do not believe [2] in the resurrection, woe unto them, because of what is laid up for them ! It would be better for them, according to such faith as they have, not to rise again at all. For the servant, whose master is preparing stripes and bonds for him, desires not to awake from his sleep. As he knows that when he awakes at dawn his master will scourge and bind him. But the good servant, to whom his master has promised gifts, looks forward to the coming dawn when he shall receive the gifts from his master. Even in his very dreams he sees his master bestowing on him what he had promised, and though asleep he rejoices and exults and is gladdened. As for the wicked, his sleep is not pleasant, when he pictures to himself the things that he is destined for when morning dawns, and in his dream his heart breaks. But the righteous sleep and their slumber is pleasant to them all through day and night. They do not notice the length of that night ; it is accounted by them as but an hour, and forthwith in the morning watch they awake alert. But as for the wicked, their sleep lies heavy on them. They are like a man laid low in a deep, severe fever, tossing hither and thither on his couch. He suffers terror the whole night through, as it lengthens itself out for him ; and he fears the dawn when his Lord will punish him.

SECTIONS 20, 21, 22 (summarised).—Our Faith teaches us that when men have once fallen asleep they slumber so deeply that they do not discern good from evil, and that the righteous do not receive their promised reward, nor the wicked their due punishment, until the Judge comes and separates the people on the right hand from those on the left.

And he goes on to enlarge on that day being a day of

[1] Possibly derived from Rev. ii. 11, xx. 14, xxi. 8.
[2] Cf. R. Has. 16; Sifre 149*b*.

Justice to all, and no longer one of Mercy, and that they who preceded us in entering on the life of faith shall not be made perfect without us (Heb. xi. 40), and that no one yet has received his full reward or punishment.

SECTION 23.—But some of dull intelligence say: If no one has yet received his reward why did the Apostle say, *When we shall depart from the body we shall be present with the Lord* (2 Cor. v. 8)? But call to mind, dearly beloved, that I instructed thee about this in the *Tractate concerning Ascetics*,[1] to the effect that the Spirit which the righteous receive at Baptism returns to the Lord according to its celestial nature, until the time of the resurrection, when it once more comes to put on the body in which it formerly dwelt. It has this (body) continually in memory in the presence of God, and pleads eagerly for the resurrection of that body in which it dwelt, as the prophet Isaiah said about the Church of the Gentiles: *They shall be faithful and instant remembrancers of thee before the Lord: and thou shalt not give them rest.*[2] But the wicked have none to plead for them before the Lord, for the Holy Spirit is departed from them because they are animal (*i.e.* the "natural" of 1 Cor. xv. 44–6), and are buried in an animal manner.

SECTION 24.—But (the followers of) doctrines, which are the instruments of the Evil One, stumble over the word spoken by our Lord: *No one hath ascended into heaven, but He that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven* (John iii. 13). "Behold," say they, "the Lord bears witness that no earthly body has ascended into heaven." In their ignorance they do not apprehend the force of this. Neither did Nicodemus, when our Lord instructed him, understand what He had been saying. And then it was that the Lord said to him: *No one hath ascended into heaven and come down again, i.e.* to tell you of the things that are found there. *If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how will ye believe heavenly things if I were to tell you of them?* No other witness came down with Me to tell you of heavenly things that ye might believe them. Elijah indeed ascended thither, but he did not come down to bear witness with Me, that there might be the true "witness of two" (Matt. xviii. 16).

[1] *Dem.* vi. 14. See p. 124.

[2] There is no verse word for word like this in either Hebrew, Septuagint, or Peshitta. It seems to be a conflation from memory of Isa. lxii. 6, 7, and other prophetic phrases.

SECTION 25.—But as for thee, dearly beloved, have no doubt touching the resurrection of the dead. For the mouth of the living God testifieth, *I cause to die and I make alive* (Deut. xxxii. 39).[1] Both words proceed out of one mouth. And as we are sure that He *causeth to die*, and see that it is so, so also is it certain and worthy of belief that He *makes alive*. That which I have explained to thee, do thou accept and believe, that in the day of the resurrection thy body shall arise in its completeness and perfection, and thou shalt receive from thy Lord the reward of thy faith, and thou shalt rejoice and be glad in all that thou hast believed.

Thus ends the Tractate on the resurrection. Nothing but a practically complete transcription could give the reader a chance of appreciating its teaching. It will be seen that his exposition of the common Christian doctrine of the resurrection bears impressive witness to the two chief points, the identity of the risen with the mortal body, and at the same time to its transformation into "a celestial" and spiritual body.

But there are one or two matters that require fuller examination. One need not detain us long. His restriction of the resurrection change to the righteous is a direct result of the reading, *We shall all sleep* [2] (*i.e.* die), *but we shall not all be changed* (1 Cor. xv. 51). This is a commonplace of the Latin Fathers, though unfamiliar to English ears, because of our following a different text, in which the "not" comes in the first member of the clause: *We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, i.e.* All men will not undergo the experience of death, for there will be some alive at the Second Coming, but all, the quick and the dead, will alike rise again, the quick immediately and without dying, and the dead after the long or short interval since their death. The righteous [3] alone, however, will be transformed. This immediate transformation of the quick is

[1] Cf. Sanh. 91*b*, Pes. 68*a*.

[2] The Latin Vulgate has "we shall all *rise again*, but we shall not all be changed." The note in the Douay version explains this just as Aphrates does, and is half inclined to regard the other reading as heretical.

[3] Observe "the righteous," not "the baptised." The Sage uses the wider term. So though he is so strong on the value of Baptism, he does not dare to usurp the Judge's prerogative. The Searcher of all hearts alone can infallibly determine who "the righteous" are.

the " great mystery " which S. Paul speaks of in the beginning of the verse. In the following verse (52) he gives a double assurance : *the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we* (*i.e.* the living) *shall be changed.* The Apostle returns to this instantaneous transformation of the living in 2 Cor. v. 1–6, which is exclusively concerned with the quick at the Lord's Coming, and has no reference to those already dead. The latter are dealt with fully in 1 Cor. xv. 12–49. The experience of the quick, described in 1 Cor. xv. 51 and 2 Cor. v. 1–6, is adumbrated in 1 Thess. iv. 17 : *Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air.*

The other point, which seems to be peculiar to Aphraates, will take more space to elucidate. It is given in brief by him in Section 23 above, but is worked out at much greater length in Tractate VI. 14–18.

Here it is in substance. Man is born with a body and an undying animal soul. At Baptism the Holy Spirit is conferred upon him. If he remains faithful, the Spirit abides with him, but leaves him if he falls into sin, and returns to him on his repentance. At the death of the righteous the Spirit returns to its heavenly home, and the body together with the animal soul is buried. The animal soul remains in a sort of unconsciousness until the resurrection, but enjoys pleasant dreams and does not find the time of waiting and happy anticipation long or tedious. Meanwhile the Spirit in heaven is earnestly pleading before God that it may be clothed again with the body that it formerly indwelt. At the resurrection the Spirit flies to the rescue of both body and soul.

The animal soul shall be swallowed up by the heavenly spirit, and, since the spirit takes possession of the body, the whole man shall be spiritual. Death shall be swallowed up in life, and the body shall be swallowed up in spirit. In the power of the spirit, that man shall fly to meet the King, who shall receive him with joy. And Christ shall render thanks to the body that hath preserved its (or His) spirit in purity.[1]

But the animal soul of the wicked, plagued during the time

[1] *Dem.* vi. 14 *ad fin.*

of waiting with evil dreams and doleful forebodings, has no one to plead for it before God, since the spirit received in Baptism hath departed from him before his death, and according to its nature cometh before Christ and accuseth [1] that man that he hath grieved it.

So at the resurrection the body and animal soul of the wicked are raised up unchanged and go into punishment.

Aphraates gets himself into great confusion over the doctrine of the human soul.[2] First and foremost his bent and purpose is not theological. He belongs entirely to the pastoral order of mind, which directs its efforts mainly to living and getting others to live the Christian life. Even there a background of theology is necessary, but it is not necessarily systematic. The pastoral mind can be impatient of system, and run itself into difficulties and obscurities [3] in consequence.

Then, again, our author had no systematic theology in his own tongue to guide him, and he was living in a remote land far removed from association with theologians of the Greek or Latin world, even if he understood their languages, which is more than doubtful. What was his personal loss is our gain. For we have in his writings an unsophisticated presentation of the Christian tradition by a singularly devout and candid mind, which put practical life first, and is only theological in spite of itself, simply because any ethical teaching must imply doctrinal postulates. Aphraates

[1] Cf. Hermas: Afflict not the Holy Spirit which dwelleth in thee lest He make intercession against thee with God and depart from thee (*Mand.* x. 3, 2).

[2] A similar confusion is found in a Homily attributed to Macarius (who was approximately of the same date as Aphraates), and recently published by the Rev. G. L. Marriott at the Harvard University Press. Chapter 4 of Homily 52 has, "As there is one soul in the whole body," etc. But the following chapter speaks of this soul, "apart from the heavenly soul and Divine Spirit," as being defective, and definitely says: "The Lord has been pleased for man to have two souls, one the created and one heavenly from the Divine Spirit" (*Macarii Anecdota*, p. 26).

[3] The late Archdeacon Lee, Divinity Professor T.C.D., after listening to the sermon of a famous preacher who had stirred us undergraduates of the seventies to the marrow, was heard enumerating the heresies unconsciously broached by the preacher, which totalled upwards of ten, unless memory fails. But the great theologian knew well that the future bishop had talked heresy without being a heretic!

betrays no symptoms of having thought out the postulates involved in his practical teaching.

Consequently it need excite no surprise that he is occasionally confused and hard to follow. He was emphatically a man of one book, and that book the Bible, which, whilst it contains the elements of all Christian theology, is as practical in its outlook as this earnest student of it was. It is not a manual of systematic theology. It would be most unjust to accuse him of heresy, as a fellow countryman [1] of his own did, because of some erratic opinions. He shows no trace of the heretical mind, which displays itself in a conscious rejection of the known general judgment of Christendom. There are many subsidiary topics on which such a general judgment has not been and probably never will be pronounced, and on which theologians of note express different opinions: *e.g.* the exact meaning of the inspiration of the Bible. A respectful and receptive attitude of mind towards the settled conclusions of the Church, and modesty and moderation in discussing unsettled problems become all honest inquirers. The Persian Sage fails in neither respect. What could be more seemly than the following, at the close of the second collection of Tractates?

I have written these dissertations for our brethren and beloved, the children of the Church of God, that those who read them wherever they may reach, may remember my insignificance in their prayers, and know that I too am a sinner and an erring man, and yet may know that I hold this faith which I have above set forth and commended to them in these chapters. . . . I have written these things as well as I can. But if any one should read these disquisitions and find in them some words that do not agree with his thought, do not let him make light of them. For whatever is written in these chapters, is written not according to one man's opinion, nor to persuade a single reader, but according to the mind of the whole Church of God and to commend to men the universal faith. If he should read and hear with conviction, it is well; and if not, I must say that I write for men open to conviction and not for the

[1] George, Bishop of the Arabians, of the end of the seventh and beginning of the eighth centuries; Ryssel, *Ein Brief Georges, Bischof der Araber*, 1883; cf. Dom Parisot, *Dict. Theol. Cath.* vol. i. p. 1019; 1903.

lightminded. Again, if the reader should find certain opinions set forth in one way by one Sage [1] and in another by another, let him not be disturbed. For every one speaks to his hearers to the best of his ability. If some of my words do not agree with those of another speaker, I who wrote these things will say that those wise words of the other were well spoken, yet it seemed right to me to speak just as I have. And if any one is wishful to instruct and convince me in any matter, I will listen to him without contention. Every one who reads the Holy Scriptures, both the former and the latter in both Testaments, with a desire to be instructed, is able to learn and to teach. But if he raises contentions about the things that he cannot understand, his mind does not receive instruction. If therefore he should find questions that are too deep for him, the meaning of which he cannot perceive, let him say thus: "What is written is written well, but I cannot attain to the understanding of it." So if he ask men of the greatest sagacity, and full of discernment in inquiring into doctrine, about those matters that are too difficult for him, and ten Sages give him ten different solutions of the same problem, let him accept that which best commends itself to him; but if some please him not, let him not censure the Sages,[2] for the word of God is like a pearl, that has an entrancing beauty, whichever way you turn it. *Prove all things; hold fast that which is good* (1 Thess. v. 21). . . . I in my insignificance have written these things—a man sprung from Adam, fashioned by the hands of God, a student of the Holy Scriptures. . . . So whoever shall read anything that I have written above, let him read with a desire to learn, and pray for the author as a brother of the Body, that through the prayers of the whole Church of God my sins may be forgiven me.

After these wise and tolerant words written when there had already broken out the persecution [3] which was to test their first hearers and not find them wanting, anything that

[1] Sage is practically=the Rabbinic *Haham* or Biblical expert.

[2] It is very likely that it was from the recurrence in this passage of the term that his countrymen conferred on him the title of the Persian Sage.

[3] If Aphraates himself had been one of the martyrs it is incredible that his name should not have been in the lists of the sixteen thousand known martyrs, who besides many others perished in Sapor's persecution. The fury fell specially on the bishops, the clergy and the professed Ascetics, who were necessarily more conspicuous and had incurred the hostility of the Zoroastrian priesthood by their evangelistic zeal. Buildings, books, records perished. It is no marvel that there is complete obscurity over the manner of his end. Cf. *Dem.* xxi. 23 *ad fin.*

may be added must be rather in the nature of an anti-climax. Still the errors with regard to the soul, into which the Persian Sage fell through lack of philosophic training, demand a few words. It looks as if he grew puzzled between the rabbinic teaching, which we presume him to have imbibed, and the apparent trichotomy of S. Paul in 1 Thess. v. 23. The tripartite division of a human being into " spirit, soul, and body " is thus described by Lightfoot :—

> *The spirit*, which is the ruling faculty in man, and through which he holds communication with the unseen world—the *soul*, which is the seat of all his impulses and affections, the centre of his personality—the *body*, which links him to the material world and is the instrument of all his outward deeds (*Notes on Epp. of S. Paul*, p. 89).

It is quite possible that S. Paul had no intention of formulating a scientific division of man into these three categories, but the threefold organisation was generally recognised by the early Fathers,[1] and was believed to be derived from S. Paul. Some modern scholars, however, take Aphraates' view, viz. that the " spirit " in this passage is not part of the original endowment of man, but

> designates that portion of the divine Spirit which as dwelling permanently in the individual constitutes the spirit of man that is in him (1 Cor. ii. 11).[2]

Aphraates would have accepted this definition, except the word " permanently." He, as may be seen above (Section 23 and p. 122), regarded the continuance of the Spirit's indwelling as dependent on the man's moral state.

It is noticeable that those who take this view suffer from the very thing which left Aphraates at the mercy of puzzlements. Neither he nor they have a firm grasp [3] of the Personality of the Holy Ghost. He in his remote and isolated position was at a stage in the development of

[1] See Ellicott, *ad loc.*, for quotations and references.

[2] J. E. Frame, *on Thess. Intern. Crit. Com.* p. 211, where, however, Aphraates, with his baptismal doctrine, is not quoted.

[3] It is significant that Theodore of Mopsuestia, who is suspect in other directions, alone of ancient writers supports Aphraates on this point, *Th. Mop.* ii. 39, quoted by Swete ; see Frame, *op. cit.* p. 212.

religious thought when the full content of New Testament teaching had not been worked out, under the pressure at once of Christian experience and of heretical tampering with the Christian tradition. Aphraates in considered statement and in his baptismal practice acknowledges the Three Persons of the Godhead,[1] but again and again it is hard to know whether by Spirit or Holy Spirit he means the Third Person of the Holy Trinity or His gifts of grace. With our clear conception of the Personality of the Holy Ghost, we can use such an expression as " Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest—or of a Bishop—in the Church of God," without risk of confusion or misunderstanding, though it is a gift of the Holy Spirit and not His Person which is being conferred. And we speak of the Holy Spirit being given in Confirmation, when, as we explain, it is His sevenfold gifts that are intended.

But Aphraates had not the guidance of a formulated Creed [2] on the subject of the Third Person of the Godhead, and his usage suffers accordingly. A passage from Tractate VI. will illustrate this :—

And so, my beloved, we too have received of this same Spirit of Christ, as it is written that the same Spirit spake through the mouth of the prophet : *I will dwell in them and walk in them* (Lev. xxi. 12). Therefore let us make ready our temples for the Spirit of Christ, and let us not grieve Him lest He depart from us. Remember in what manner the Apostle warns you : *Grieve not the Holy Spirit whereby ye have been sealed unto the day of redemption* (Eph. iv. 30). By Baptism [3] we receive the Spirit

[1] Cf. *Dem.* xxiii. 60. " There is One God, One His Christ, One Spirit, one Faith, one Baptism " (*ib.* 61). " Glory and honour be to the Father, and to His Son, and to His Living and Holy Spirit, from the mouth of all above and below who laud Him to the ages of ages. Amen. Amen." And for Baptism in the threefold Name (*ib.* 63), " If those three glorious and worshipful Names of Father, Son and Holy Spirit are real to thee, which were invoked upon thy head, when thou receivedst the signation of thy life ; if thy Baptism is real to thee," etc. And cf. *ib.* 52, 53, 59 ; *Dem.* i. 5 ; vi. 1, 12, 13, 14 ; xiv. 47 ; xviii. 10 ; xxi. 21.

[2] What exactly the baptismal symbol of Aphraates was is nowhere set forth in his Tractates. It would have been gratuitous information to those for whom he wrote. A portion of the common baptismal Creed seems embedded in *Dem.* i. 19. See the question treated at length by Dom Connolly and H. L. Pass in the articles in *J. T. S.* vol. vi. and vol. ix.

[3] It should be borne in mind that Baptism and Confirmation form one service in the East, as they did universally at one time. Consequently

of Christ, for in that hour that the Priests invoke the Spirit, the heavens open and He hovers over the waters and they that are baptised are clothed therewith; but from all that are born of the flesh the Spirit remains afar off until they come to the new birth by water, and then they receive the Holy Spirit. In the first birth they are born with an animal soul which is created within man, and this henceforward is not subject to death, as it is written: *Man became a living soul* (Gen. ii. 7). But in the second birth, namely Baptism, they receive from the very Godhead the Holy Spirit, which is ever immortal. When men die, the animal soul is buried with the body, and consciousness is taken away from it, but the heavenly Spirit that they received departs to Christ according to its nature. These two things the Apostle has made known, for he saith: *It is buried an animal body and it is raised a spiritual body* (1 Cor. xv. 44). The Spirit departeth again to Christ according to its nature, as the Apostle further said: *When we depart from the body we shall be with our Lord* (2 Cor. v. 8). For the Spirit of Christ which the spiritual receive departs to our Lord while the animal spirit is buried in its own nature, and consciousness is taken from it. Whosoever hath kept the Spirit of Christ in purity, when it departs to Christ it speaks to Him after this manner: "The body unto which I came, and which put me on from the water of Baptism, hath preserved me in holiness." And the Holy Spirit will plead earnestly with Christ for the resurrection of that body which has preserved it in purity, and seek to be once more united with it, so that that body shall be raised up in glory.[1]

Note how the word "Spirit" and "Holy Spirit" waver between the Personal Holy Ghost, His gifts in Baptism, and that gift personified and constituting a higher, conscious element in the baptised.[2] The "spirit" bestowed in Baptism addresses Christ, when it returns to Him at the person's

passages like this cannot be quoted to settle the question whether it is in Baptism or in Confirmation that the Holy Spirit is conferred, when the combined service is split up into two, and separated by years. Aphraates probably refers to Confirmation when he speaks of "*the bestowal of the Sign*" at the time of Baptism, according to the customary ceremonial. Eastern confirmation takes the form of signing the Cross on the person with the sacred Chrism. *Dem.* vii. 13; and for Chrism and its uses, *Dem.* xxiii. 3.

[1] *Dem.* vi. 14.

[2] Doubtless it was this strange personification which caused Gennadius or his informant to accuse the writer of preaching "two souls" (P. L. Tom. 58, p. 1062).

death, and reports on its treatment. And note carefully, that at this point " the Holy Spirit," distinguished from the returned spirit, takes up the case and pleads for the resurrection of the body, which is so well reported on. So that in spite of all the confusion of language, there is no serious reason to doubt the author's substantial orthodoxy [1] on the Personality of God the Holy Ghost. His apparent personification of the baptismal gift cannot be defended, though perhaps it is no more than a case of muddled psychology.

The sage's other peculiarity, viz. the doctrine of the soul's unconsciousness, enlivened by dreams, in the period between death and the general resurrection, is more easily explained. He simply seized on the Biblical euphemism of sleep or falling asleep to denote death, and allowed it to dominate his thought of the intermediate life to the exclusion of all other scriptural hints regarding the disembodied soul's experiences.[2]

An analysis of the Biblical passages, where sleep is used for dying, yields three leading ideas: 1. As sleep ends the activity of the day, death brings all the turmoils of life to an end; (2) the body's rest in sleep typifies its prolonged quiescence in death; (3) sleep as a synonym for death implies a state of peace and rest for the soul also. But it is pressing the metaphor too far to make it mean a complete state of unconsciousness, as Aphraates does sometimes. Besides it overlooks entirely the glimpses of conscious action given in our Lord's parable of Dives and Lazarus, and His promise to the dying robber, *To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise* (Luke xxiii. 43); and in the intercessions of the souls under the Altar (Rev. vi. 9–11). S.

[1] How lamentable it is that Dr. Swete did not take Aphraates into account in his 1912 volume on *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church!* It is exactly where his sureness of touch, his breadth of outlook, and his comprehensive learning would have done inestimable service. Was it that he did not feel at home in Syriac, or was he repelled by the distorted portrait of the Persian Sage in Dr. Burkitt's popular lectures? Dr. Downer does not use Aphraates either in the *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit.*

[2] ψυχοπαννύχια is a Rabb. idea; cf. *b. Shab.* 152*b*: " During the 12 months (after death) the body remains and the soul ascends and descends; after that the body disappears and the soul goes up and does not come down again."

Paul's happy looking forward to be with Christ after his departure (2 Cor. v. 8) would be meaningless, if at death he entered on a state of coma. His confidence that the good work begun in the Philippians (i. 6) will be carried on to a finish, the goal being the Day of Jesus Christ, points to a life of conscious active growth in the peace of the beyond. S. Peter (2 Epist. iii. 18, 19) seems to assert the conscious activity of our Lord's " spirit " in the interval between its separation from and return to the body. In a word, this condemnation of the soul to sleep, and not the body only, is indistinguishable from its extinction. Life implies movement, consciousness, progress. Moreover the doctrine wipes out all hope of improvement in the waiting time for souls dying imperfect.

It is true that Aphraates meets these objections by transferring the seat of personality to the gift of the Spirit given in Baptism, whether he be understood actually to personify the gift or not. At all events he makes " the gift of the Spirit " enjoy all the advantages promised to the conscious personality. No one nowadays is likely to follow him in this eccentric speculation, but the conception of the soul sinking into a state of unconsciousness at death has had some vogue in post-Reformation times amongst men who sought an easy way of stifling all discussion of the intermediate state. Our Lord's rebuke to the Sadducees that the so-called dead are the really living should have given Aphraates pause, and should be pondered by those who follow him in little else except his defective notion of the soul's condition in the waiting time. Progress, not stagnation, is characteristic of Life. The progress of souls that have departed in much imperfection implies some cleansing process. Aphraates escaped from all such problems by sending the soul as well as the body to sleep.

Enough of the ungrateful task of criticising the one or two flaws in the ancient worthy's armour. His unflinching adherence to the traditional teaching of the Church regarding the resurrection of the body is all the more impressive because of the independence of mind, which led him astray in some directions. As far as the existing evidence goes,

his speculations seem to be original and peculiar to himself.[1]

Bibliography of Publications on Aphraates

Bickell, *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen des Bischofs Jackob Aphraates von Mar Matthäus*, 1874.

Sasse, *Prolegom. in Aph. Sap. Pers. Serm. Hom.*, 1879.

Forget, *De Vit. et Script. Aphr.*, 1882.

Bert, a full translation into German with notes, tom. 3 *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 1888.

Duval, *Anciennes Litteratures Chrétiennes: La Littérature Syriaque*, 1899, pp. 47 and 225–30.

Graffin's edition of complete Syriac text with Latin translation, Introduction, notes, *Apparatus criticus*, Lexicon, etc., by Dom Parisot, *Patrologia Syriaca*, vol. i., published 1894, and vol. ii., 1904.

Dom Parisot's Articles on *L'Âme* and on *Aphraates* in vols. i. and ii. *Dictionnaire de Theol. Cath.*, 1904.

Labourt, *Le Christianisme Dans L'Empire Perse*, 1904, pp. 24–50, 81, 342.

P. Schwen, *Afrahat, seine Person und sein Verständnis des Chrisentums*, 1907.

J. M. Chavanis, *Les Lettres d'Afrahat le sage Perse, étudiées au point de vue de l'historie et de la Doctrine*, 1908.

Tixeront, *L'Histoire des Dogmes* (only accessible in English translation, St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A., 1914). See vol. ii. pp. 200–7.

Nestle's Article on Aphraates in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, vol. i., remarkable for the amount of reliable matter crammed into a small space.

Against this we have not one single complete edition for English readers to show; only articles and lectures, as follows:—

1. Dr. Gwynn gives a useful study of Aphraates and his works with a translation of seven of the twenty-three Tractates in *Nicene* and *Post-Nicene Fathers, New Series*, vol. xiii. 1898. But it is tucked away in a cumbersome volume dealing with Gregory the Great and S. Ephrem.

2. Two popular Lectures by F. C. Burkitt, *Early Christianity Outside the Roman Empire*, 1899; and six Lectures on *Early Eastern Christianity*, 1904, contains a good deal about Aphraates.

3. Some of the assumptions of the above Lectures are severely criticised by Dom Connolly in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. vi. 522. A not very successful rejoinder in *J. T. S.* vol. vii. 10.

4. An extremely useful Article on Aphraates is given in *The Jewish Encyclopædia*, vol. i. 1901. It dwells mainly on the Rabbinical sources of his Old Testament exegesis, and on the absence of all bitterness against the Jews, though nine of the twenty-three Tractates are in direct controversy with them.

5. There is a good short Article in *The Catholic Encyclopædia*, vol. i.

---

[1] It is tempting but beyond our purview in this treatise to do more than just mention his teaching on the Real Presence in the Eucharist (*Dem.* iii. 2; iv. 19; xi. 12; *et al.*); on the Eucharistic Sacrifice (*Dem.* xvi. 3); and not only on Public Penance (*Dem.* xiv. 44), but on Private Confession and Absolution, and the Seal on the Priest's lips (*Dem.* vii. 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 15), not as something novel but as the usual procedure of the Church, about which it does not occur to him that there could be any controversy. These out of many other interesting testimonies are mentioned because amongst English readers so little is known of the Persian Sage.

1907, with a slight tendency, however, to stress unduly Aphraates' references to the Virginity of our Lady.

6. H. L. Pass has a most valuable study on *The Creed of Aphraates* in *J. T. S.* vol. ix. pp. 267–84, 1908. Some details need revision by an expert in Jewish lore.

7. Dr. Wigram gives a few pages to Aphraates in *The Assyrian Church*, pp. 57 and 266–8, 1910; and contributes a rather thin notice to Murray's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 1911.

8. Dr. Bethune-Baker gives a few lines to Aphraates in *Nestorius and his Teaching*, p. 120; Dr. Darwell Stone quotes him in his *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, vol. i. pp. 124–5. Otherwise English theologians have left him alone.

If we could claim an English scholar's contribution to a German magazine, Dom Connolly's Article on the Creed of Aphraates in *Zeits. f. d. N. T. Wissens. u. d. Kun. d. Urchrist.* pp. 202 *seq.*, 1906, would do much to redress the balance.

The forthcoming volume on Aphraates by Mr. Danby of S. George's College, Jerusalem, is eagerly awaited. The present sketch of Aphraates owes much of whatever value it may possess to his generously placing at the writer's disposal his unrivalled knowledge of Syriac and the cognate languages, as well as of the modern literature relating to them.

CHAPTER IX

EASTERN TEACHING

ANTE-NICENE PERIOD (*continued*)

AFTER Minucius Felix and Lactantius we have no Latin books extant of any consequence until we reach the age of Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine. But there is a galaxy of Greek authors worthy of close study. Of these not all treat at any length of the resurrection of the body. After a careful search, only the following are found to contain reasoned discussions of the doctrine.

S. Methodius, Bishop of Tyre, martyred about 312 A.D.—S. Methodius, who flourished at the end of the third century and beginning of the fourth, was a distinguished writer, but he has suffered the fate of many greater men. Only one work of his has survived, though lengthy quotations from others are to be found in subsequent writers.

His book *On the Resurrection* deserves careful analysis for this, if for no other reason, that it is exceptional amongst Greek theological writings in laying more stress on the continuity of the resurrection body than on its transformation. It is, in fact, a thoroughgoing reaction from Origen, and is an anticipation of Jerome without his passion and vehemence.

The treatise consists of sixteen chapters, of which a brief analysis with occasional quotations ought to be useful, for it is not accorded a position commensurate with its importance in English discussions of the resurrection.

The two first chapters are introductory, but contain a much-needed protest against excessive allegorising of Holy Scripture.

The third and fourth come to grips at once with what is a distinct fault in Origen's teaching. In his earlier works

he was still too much under the dominion of Platonic ideas, and amongst other conceptions, logically destructive of Christian doctrine, he clung to the idea of the pre-existence of souls, as we have seen. This led to the further Platonic idea that the body is a sort of prison-house, into which the soul is sent in consequence of the Fall.

Here in the body pent, absent from Him I roam

is the burden of many ascetic musings of men who had no intention of saying anything heretical, and it is susceptible of an orthodox meaning,[1] though so much can hardly be claimed for Origen's version of it, if his words are to be strained to their full logical implications. That he had not explored those implications is as certain as that he would have strenuously rejected anything contrary to the teaching of the Church. But words once committed to paper and published have their own destiny quite independently of their author's intentions. All that is involved in them must be held to be open to criticism, whether he who wrote them saw it all clearly or not.

S. Methodius puts his finger firmly but gently on this blot in the earlier teaching of his great predecessor, a good hundred years after they were written, and when the full consequences of them had been worked out :—

It is evidently absurd [he says] to suppose that the body will not co-exist along with the soul in the eternal state, because of its being a bond and fettering[2] us.

And he refers to his work on Free-will for the proof that " the flesh is not the soul's chain."

As a figtree which has taken root in a temple and threatens to disrupt it has to be uprooted and destroyed before the building can be repaired, so God by the opportune discipline ot death uproots sin from His temple, *i.e.* from

Man, in order that the flesh, after sin is withered and dead, may like a restored temple be raised again with the same parts,

[1] See the Epistle to Diognetus, *c.* 6, for a good use of the prison-house idea, Funk, *Patr. Ap.* vol. i. p. 400.

[2] *Lib. de Resurr.* 3, P. G. Tom. 18, p. 268.

immortal and uninjured, sin having been utterly driven [1] out of its foundations (*c.* 5).

Just as a skilled craftsman, finding a statue of his mutilated or spoilt, melts it down and fashions it afresh, that it may be perfectly beautiful and faultless, so God, seeing His fairest handiwork, man, defaced by the treacherous counsels of envy, could not in His love for man endure to leave it in such a condition. He melts it down, as it were, into its original materials, in order that by a remodelling all its blemishes might fade away and disappear. And, indeed, the prophet Jeremiah uses a similar figure of the potter and his misshapen vessel (xviii. 3–6). The potter reduces it to clay again, and starts to remodel it, that it may be free from all blemishes and be faultless and pleasing. The mighty Hand of God deals similarly with humanity (*cc.* 6 and 7).

And on the larger scale, Scripture gives us to understand that the whole universe will undergo a complete purification, and be made fair and clean and sweet again (Rom. viii. 1–21) :—

The creation, then, after its restoration to a better and more seemly state, retains its identity, and rejoices and exults over God's children at the resurrection. It is for their sakes that it groans and travails now, waiting itself also for our redemption from the corruption of the body, that when we have risen and shaken off the mortality of the flesh according to the Scripture saying—*Shake off the dust and arise and sit down, O Jerusalem* (Isa. lii. 2)—and when we have been made free from sin, the flesh itself also may be made free from its corruption, being subject then to righteousness and no longer to vanity.[2]

It is true that the Scriptures speak of the heavens and the earth passing away and perishing, but that is their usual method of speaking of the change from the world's present condition to a better and more glorious one :—

We are to expect that the Creation will pass away, dying, as it were, in the burning in order that it may be renewed.

[1] *Lib. de Resurr.* 5, P. G. Tom. 18, p. 269.
[2] *Ib.* 8, P. G. Tom. 18, pp. 273–6.

Certainly we are not to think that it will be destroyed, but that in a renewed world we, being ourselves renewed, may dwell without taste of sorrow. For as the earth is to exist after this age, there must needs be inhabitants for it, who shall no longer be liable to death, nor shall marry nor have families, but shall live in supreme happiness as the angels, and be in incorruption and no longer liable to change.[1]

Yes, men are *to be like unto the angels*, in mode of life and happiness, but not to become angels. Each order of being retains its own nature :—

For man having been appointed, in the original disposition of things, to inhabit the world and to rule over all that is therein, will never, on his attaining immortality, be changed from being man into the form either of angels or of any other beings ; just as the angels do not undergo a change from their original fashion to another form. For Christ did not come proclaiming that man's nature, when it is become immortal, should be remoulded or transformed into another nature, but into what it was originally [2] before the Fall. . . . For neither did God, as if He had made man badly or committed a mistake in the fashioning of him, change His mind and determine afterwards to make him into an angel, as skilless craftsmen are wont to do. For man, we say, consists of soul and body ; man therefore will exist not without but with a body, lest haply he should become another being than man. . . . " For," saith Wisdom (ii. 23), " *God created man immortal, and made him an image of His own eternity.*" So the body does not perish, for man consists of body and Soul.[3]

The very word " resurrection " used by our Lord (Matt. xxii. 30, 31) implies that it is the body that is spoken of. For it is only that which is fallen that can be described as rising again. It is not the soul that falls in death, for this is immortal, but the body :—

So then, if the soul is immortal but the body remains dead, they also who say there is a resurrection but not of the flesh, deny in effect any resurrection at all. For it is not that which is standing that can be said to be raised up, but that which is fallen down and lies prone.[4]

[1] *Lib. de Resurr.* 9, P. G. Tom. 18, p. 276.
[2] Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *De An. et Resurr.*, P. G. Tom. 46, p. 148.
[3] *Ib.* 10 and 11, P. G. Tom. pp. 271–80.
[4] *Ib.* 12, P. G. Tom. 18, pp. 281–4.

He, who was not man, became man that "*as in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive*" (1 Cor. xv. 22). For if He bore the flesh for any other reason than that of setting the flesh free and raising it up, why did He bear flesh superfluously, if He purposed neither to save it nor to raise it? But the Son of God does nothing superfluously. He did not take the form of a servant uselessly, but to raise it up and save it. For He truly was made man, and died, and that not in mere appearance, but that He might truly be shown to be the first-begotten from the dead, changing the earthly into the heavenly and the mortal into the immortal (*c.* 13).

In chapter 14 S. Methodius uses an argument for continuity which Athenagoras and others employ, but not less forcibly than they:—

If then out of such a small drop (of human seed) previously without existence, and in its actual state of moistness, contractedness, and insignificance, man is brought into being, how much rather shall man spring again out of a previously existing man! . . . Now if we will place seed of man beside a dead body, which of them as they lie exposed to view will the spectators think the more likely to become a man—that drop which is so utterly insignificant, or that thing which has already shape, size, and substance? For if the very thing that is a mere nothing at all, because God so pleases, becomes a man, how much rather shall that which has existence and is brought to perfection become again a man, if God pleases! . . . What was the object of the Feast of Tabernacles, those booths decked out with boughs and leaves which immediately wither and lose their verdure? It was introduced to point to this real tabernacle of ours, which, though it has fallen into corruption through transgression of the law and been broken up by sin, God has promised to put together again and to raise up in incorruptibility, in order that we may celebrate in His honour the great and glorious feast of Tabernacles at the Resurrection, when our tabernacles are put together in the perfect order of immortality and harmony, and raised up from the dust in incorruption, when the dry bones according to the most true prophecy (Ezek. xxxvii. 4–14) shall hear a voice and shall be brought to their joints by God the Creator and Perfect Artificer, who will then fashion anew the

flesh and bind it on, no more with such ties as those by which it was formerly fastened, but such as shall be for ever undecaying and imperishable, (*c.* 14).

These points are further elaborated in fragments of a second treatise on the same subject which are imbedded in S. John Damascene and in Photius, but nothing modifying the positions here taken up is to be found in them.

The observant reader will have noticed that S. Methodius persistently holds up one side of the shield, that on which CONTINUITY is inscribed, but incidental glimpses of the other side can be caught. The body, though the same, has been subjected to "renewal," to "re-fashioning," and in its resurrection state is freed from "mortality and corruption," and is "immortal, undecaying, and imperishable." He had been disquieted by some of Origen's hasty expressions, and saw the need of emphasising the continuity of a complete humanity, in fact of σάρξ ("the flesh") in the old biblical sense.[1]

Athanasius, born 296, *died* 373 A.D.—Athanasius became Bishop of his native city of Alexandria in 328, and died after a stormy but glorious episcopate of forty-five years in 373. His main work for Christian theology lay at the other end of the scale from the subject of the present treatise, but in vindicating the truth of the Godhead of the Eternal Son, he did not neglect the truth of His Humanity. In doing so, the reality of His resurrection is set forth with incomparable lucidity.[2] It is generally in dealing with this high theme that S. Athanasius speaks of the resurrection of the body. It is nowhere discussed by him in isolation from our Lord's Resurrection. He sees that both stand or fall together. Answering the cavil that hunger, thirst, and death misbecame the august Son of God, he concludes thus :—

Why then did He not prevent His own Death as He prevented His being sick? Because it was for this very purpose

[1] See Appendices A, B, and C.

[2] His writings are full of his straightforward, balanced statement of the twofold aspect of the Incarnation. Sections 16–33 of the *Or. de Incarn. Verbi*, P. G. Tom. 25, pp. 123–53, are priceless as an exposition of the twin truths of the true Godhead and true Manhood.

(*i.e.* of His Death) that He had a body, and it was unmeet that He should prevent it (*i.e.* His Death), lest the Resurrection also should be hindered. It was equally unfitting that sickness should precede His Death, lest it should be regarded as a weakness on the part of Him Who was in the Body. "Did He not hunger then?" Yes, He hungered, for that is a characteristic of the body. But it did not perish of hunger because of the Lord Who bore it. Hence, though He died as a ransom for all, yet He saw not corruption. His Body rose whole and complete, since it belonged to none other but to Him Who is the very Life.[1]

The same section opens with the words :—

Certainly, as the common Saviour of all died on our behalf, we the faithful in Christ no longer die as before, agreeably to the warning of the Law, for such condemnation has ceased; but, since corruption has come to an end and has vanished by virtue of the Resurrection, it remains that we, agreeably to the mortal nature of our body, are dissolved, when God wills for each, in order that we may be able to gain a better resurrection. For like the seeds that are cast into the earth we do not perish by dissolution, but sown, as it were, in the earth we shall rise again, death having been brought to nought by the grace of the Saviour. Hence the blessed Paul, bringing assurance of resurrection to all, says: "This corruptible must put on incorruption," etc.[2] (1 Cor. xv. 53–5).

And, besides, the death which the Saviour came to accomplish was not His own due but men's; consequently He put not off His Body by a death proper to Himself (for being the Life He had no such liability), but He accepted death at the hands of men in order that He might in His own Body completely destroy it when it advanced against Him. Again also from the following, one might see how reasonable it is that the Lord's Body should meet such an end. For it was for the resurrection of the body, which He was about to accomplish, that the Lord was specially concerned. For He was bent on showing to all men this (His Resurrection) as a token of victory over death, and on assuring all men of His having accomplished the wiping out of corruption, and on assuring them of the incorruption in due time of their bodies and as a gage of this and a proof of the resurrection that shall come to all, He preserved His own Body incorrupt.[3]

[1] *Or. de Incarn. Verbi*, 21 *ad fin*, P. G. Tom. 25, p. 133.
[2] *Ib.* p. 132. [3] *Ib.* p. 136.

For of old, before the Divine sojourn on earth of the Saviour took place, even to the Saints themselves death was terrible, and all bewailed the act of dying as though they were perishing, but now that the Saviour has raised up His Body, death is no longer terrible, but all who believe in Christ tread it under as being of no account, and choose to die rather than deny the faith in Christ. For they really know that in dying they do not perish, but both live and become incorrupt through the Resurrection.[1]

Next in order come two distinguished brothers, of whom we have fuller personal information than of any of their generation—Basil the Great and his brother Gregory of Nyssa—both from their own letters and from other contemporary documents. Their bosom friend, Gregory Nazianzus, is naturally included with them. So also Cyril of Jerusalem belongs to the same group.

Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea, 370–379.—The parents of Basil and Gregory were Christians of wealth and family. His father prepared Basil privately for the University. His sister Macrina, eldest of a family of ten, the prototype of devoted women scholars, was one of the greatest influences in his life. He travelled extensively as a young man, and then spent four years at Athens, Julian, afterwards the apostate Emperor, being his fellow student and close friend.[2] After the University he spent some time as a Professor and Public Lecturer, but under his sister's influence he was converted and baptised. Eventually he embraced the Ascetic Life, giving up his extensive private property to charitable enterprises. He founded hospitals, orphanages, schools, and other philanthropic institutions.

In his forty-first year he was consecrated Bishop of his native town of Cæsarea. He wrote, as an accomplished scholar should, a singularly lucid Greek: commentaries on Holy Scripture, sermons, letters on theological subjects, treatises on ascetic theology, flowed from his pen. Not

[1] *Or. de Incarn. Verbi*, 21 *ad fin.* P. G. Tom. 25, p. 141.

[2] Julian, on his accession, sent for Basil, intending him for great preferment; but Basil refused on account of the Emperor's denial of the Faith, and exposed himself to severe persecution. His life would have been in great danger, had not Julian perished in battle before he could carry out his hostile intention.

all have survived, but enough to justify the title which antiquity bestowed on him of Basil the Great. Naturally there are references to the resurrection of the body to be found freely in his books.

He is the first to use the transformations of insects as an illustration of the mighty changes which the body, without loss of identity, undergoes at the resurrection :—

What have you to say, you who do not believe in the change which Paul promises you at the resurrection, when you see so many metamorphoses among creatures of the air? What are we not told of the horned silkworm of India! First, it changes into a caterpillar, then becomes a buzzing insect, and not content with this form it clothes itself instead of wings with loose broad scales. Thus, ladies, when you are seated unwinding their product—I mean the silkyarn which the Chinese send you to make your delicate dresses—remember the metamorphoses of this creature and conceive a clear idea of the resurrection, and do not refuse to believe in the change that Paul announces for all men.[1]

The three writers of weight, who are closely associated with S. Basil (his younger brother Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, his friend Gregory of Nazianzus, and Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem), all took part in the Council of Constantinople (381). Though they survived it by some years, they belong properly as writers to what for convenience' sake is called the Nicene period. Constantinople, the Second of the General Councils, closes the period, since it crossed the t's and dotted the i's, as it were, of the earlier Council. Two of these influential Church leaders devote considerable space to our subject, viz. Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Jerusalem. Gregory of Nazianzus has less matter bearing on the resurrection, but some of outstanding importance.

[1] *Hexaëm. Hom.* viii. 8, P. G. Tom. 29, pp. 184–5.

For other references to the resurrection of the body see *De Spir. San.* 49, P. G. Tom. 32, p. 157; *Ep.* 5, 2, P. G. 32, p. 240; *Ep.* 8, 8 and 11, P. G. 32, pp. 257, 264; *Ep.* 302, P. G. 32, p. 1049. Cf. also *Ep.* 243, P. G. 32, p. 980, in which S. Basil accuses the heresiarch Apollinarius of "Jewish" notions about the resurrection :—

He has imaginative, nay rather Judaic conceptions of the resurrection, in which he says that we are to return to the Legal system of religion, that we are to be circumcised, to keep the Sabbath, to abstain from foods, and to offer sacrifices to God, to worship in the Temple at Jerusalem, and altogether to become Jews instead of Christians.

S. Gregory of Nyssa, Bishop, 372–395.—Gregory was much younger than Basil, whom he speaks of as his second father and master. Being delicate in his youth, he was educated at home, mainly by his sister Macrina. His writings display a wide acquaintance with the best learning of his time, and give us an attractive picture of the culture (*ad veniam verbo*) of a Christian home in that day. There is something deliciously human about the candour with which the donnish elder brother and the accomplished eldest sister let the young brother know, even when he was a Bishop, that they had formed only a moderate estimate of his abilities. The fact was, he ripened slowly, and did not display his real powers in their lifetime. His sweetness of nature and his hero-worship towards his clever elders kept him from feeling or showing the least resentment. Both the Church and the Byzantine Court showed in his latter years a very different opinion of his powers.

His literary style is not so chaste and restrained as Basil's. His jewelled prose is richer and more fervent than that of his greater brother, and is sometimes overloaded with ornament.

We shall confine ourselves to his book *On the Soul and the Resurrection*, though there is much which is of interest on the subject in his other extensive writings.[1] It is in the form of a Dialogue between himself and the sister to whom he owed so much, whom he called Teacher, and to whom he was tenderly attached. Now a Bishop of some seven years' standing, he betakes himself on a visit to her to be comforted after the death of their brother Basil, only to find her laid on a bed of sickness, from which she was never to rise. She is serene and cheerful and sets herself to disperse the clouds of grief from her beloved younger brother and old-time pupil. She succeeds in hiding from him the mortal nature of her illness, and he sits at her feet, a humble and reverent disciple, as he had done since boyhood. He plies her with all the doubts and difficulties which could beset him or any one else with regard to the

[1] See especially P. G. Tom. 44, p. 634 C; Tom. 45, p. 1279; Tom. 46, pp. 668 *sq.* 673 A, B,

future life, retiring to note down carefully from time to time, in his own inimitably beautiful language, the sacred discussions between himself and the saintly woman on the threshold of eternity. Later on, when his grief over the double bereavement had calmed down, he gave the world the benefit of this most moving record. It is the first and finest example in Christian literature of those deathbed testimonies of faith and hope, which in less exalted and less literary forms were so popular in pious households of the mid-Victorian age.

In his *Life of S. Macrina*,[1] written still later, he gives an account of his meeting with his sister. She was too weak to get up from her pallet on the floor to offer the usual obeisance to a Bishop, but leaning over and placing her hands on the floor she showed, as well as she could, her respect for the office now held by the young brother that she had nursed and brought up and taught :—

> Lest she should grieve my soul she stilled her groans and made great efforts to hide, if possible, the difficulty of her breathing. And in every way she tried to be cheerful, both taking the lead herself in friendly talk, and giving us an opportunity of asking questions. When in the course of conversation mention was made of the great Basil, my soul was saddened and my face fell dejectedly. But so far was she from sharing in my affliction, that, treating the mention of the saint as an occasion for yet loftier philosophy, she discussed various subjects, inquiring into human affairs and disclosing in her conversation the Divine purpose concealed in disasters. Besides this, she discussed the future life, as if inspired by the Holy Spirit, so that it almost seemed as if my soul were by the help of her words rapt away from mortal nature, and placed within the heavenly sanctuary.

A profound discussion of the existence, the nature and the immortality of the soul, and of the theories of the principal Greek Philosophers on the subject, takes place. She ends a striking peroration with these words :—

> But if you have a certain leaning towards this body, and

[1] Mr. W. K. Lowther Clarke's version of this work is well-executed and makes interesting reading.

disengagement from the beloved object grieves you, let not even this deprive you of hope. You will behold this corporeal covering, which is presently dissolved in death, woven again out of the same (elements), not indeed into this organism, gross and heavy as it is, but into something more subtle and ethereal, when the web has been spun anew. And the issue will be that you not only shall have in possession that which you love, but it shall be restored to you in finer and more ravishing beauty.[1]

After this burst of eloquent exposition, Gregory brings his sister back to earth again by the remark :—

But it somehow seems to me now that the doctrine of the resurrection necessarily comes on for our discussion ; a doctrine which I think is even at first sight true and credible, as it is told us in the Scriptures ; so that that will not come in question between us ; but since the weakness of human understanding is strengthened still further by any arguments that are intelligible to us, it would be well not to leave this part of the subject either without philosophical examination.[2]

S. Gregory represents his sister as opening the new phase of the discussion with a claim that a resurrection of some sort was taught by certain of the non-Christian philosophers :—

The Teacher says—As regards those who are outside our system of thought, they have in their divers ways partially arrived at the doctrine of the resurrection. None of them actually agrees with us, but none of them completely gives up some such hope.[3]

And she goes on to instance the belief in transmigration which teaches that the soul returns to a body, though not the same as it had abandoned. She subjects this belief to an acute and searching examination to show how contradictory and illogical it is.[4]

The brother marshals current objections to the resurrection of the body, beginning with this :—

Is the state we hope for to be similar to the present ? If

[1] *De An. et Resurr.*, P. G. Tom. 46, pp. 105–8.
[2] *Ib.* p. 108.
[3] *Ib.* p. 108.
[4] *Ib.* pp. 108–136.

that is really so, then I would say men should give up hoping for the resurrection. For if men's bodies are to be restored to life in the same sort of condition as they are in when they cease to breathe, then all that men can look forward to in the resurrection is an unending calamity.[1]

He draws repulsive pictures of what the body is like in extreme old age, of the bodies of people dying of consumption, of dropsy, of leprosy; of men mutilated by accident or in battle; and of cripples. He goes on to ask:—

Are the bodies of children, dead in infancy, to be raised in the same infantine condition? Where will be found the mother's milk to suckle them with?

It comes to this [he proceeds] that if our bodies are to live again in every respect as before, this thing we are expecting is simply a calamity; whereas if they are not the same, the person raised up will be another than he who died. If a little boy was buried, but a grown man rises again, or *vice versâ*, how can we say the dead in his very self is raised up, when he has some one substituted for him by virtue of this difference in age?[2] But why dwell longer on these less forcible objections and neglect the strongest one of all?

The human body is in a constant state of flux.[3] It changes from moment to moment. If a man is not the same even as he was yesterday, which day's body will rise again, or will there be a crowd—the babe, the child, the boy, the youth, the man, the father, the old man, and all the intermediate persons he once was?

Again, chastity and profligacy are lived out in one and the same body; a man at one time sins in his body and afterwards repents and then relapses into sin again. In which body is the

[1] *De An. et Resurr.*, P. G. Tom. 46, p. 137.

[2] *Ib.* pp. 137–41 (summarised).

[3] S. Gregory restates this fact in his *De Mortuis* (P. G. Tom. 46, p. 521 B) very forcibly:—

It is not going beyond the truth to say that death is woven into the texture of our life. Such an idea one can find to be based on truth, since experience bears witness to this belief that in material substance the man of to-day is not the same as the man of yesterday, but that something of him is constantly dying, becoming fetid, and is destroyed and ejected. . . . Wherefore, as the great Paul says, *we die daily*; we are not always the same persons remaining in the same house of the body, but each moment we change from what we were, by addition or rejection, altering continually into a fresh body.

sinner to be punished? Is it in that which has grown stiff in old age? But this is not the body which did the sin. Or again —to take a favourite cavil of unbelievers—they urge that no part of the body is made without function. Now if the life to come is to be in exactly the same circumstances as this, what use will there be of those members of our body, for which there are no corresponding activities in that other life? When the operations of eating, drinking, digesting, of child-bearing no longer exist, how or wherefore will their organs in our bodies continue to exist? [1]

When I had finished [says Gregory] the Teacher thus replied: "You have attacked the doctrine of the resurrection in fine style, after the so-called rhetorical manner, skirting round the truth plausibly enough with destructive arguments, so that those who have not very carefully considered this mysterious truth might perhaps be affected by your plausible presentation of those arguments, and might think that the difficulties started against the aforesaid belief were very much to the point. But the truth," says she, "does not lie that way, even if we were to find it impossible to reply with similar rhetorical arguments. The true explanation of all those questions is laid up in the hidden treasure-houses of Wisdom, then only to come to light when we shall be taught the mystery of the resurrection by our experience of it, when no longer will there be need of words to explain the things that are at present matters of hope. Just as many debating points might be agitated amongst men sitting up at night as to what sunshine is like, and then the mere appearing of it in its loveliness renders superfluous any description of it in words, so every speculation that tries to arrive conjecturally at the future state is reduced to nothingness, when that which we look for comes to us in actual experience. But since it is our duty not to leave the arguments brought against us unexamined, we will proceed to consider them." [2]

Let us first get a clear notion, she proceeds, of the scope of the doctrine; of the end which Holy Scripture had in view in declaring it and causing it to be believed. She defines the resurrection as "the rehabilitation [3] of our

[1] *De An. et Resurr.*, P. G. Tom. 46, pp. 141–5.
[2] *Ib.* p. 145.
[3] Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, P. G. Tom. 44, p. 634 C *ad fin.*; and 46, p. 878 A. S. Augustine, on the other hand, argues that the resurrection condition will be superior to that of our first parents in Paradise, cf. P. L. Tom. 32, p. 601; cf. also Julianus Pomerius:—

nature, its restoration to its original form" (*ἀνάστασίς ἐστιν ἡ εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν ἀποκατάστασις*).

In that primal life, of which God was the Creator, there was in all likelihood neither old age nor infancy nor any of the distempers which form our manifold infirmities, nor any sort of bodily misery at all, for it is not likely that God would create such things. Human nature was a divine thing before humanity came under the assault of evil. All these things broke in upon us with the entrance of evil. Therefore a life free from evil is under no necessity whatever of being involved in the results of such things. A man walking through ice must get his body chilled, or is browned if he walks in a very hot sun, but he escapes if he keeps clear of both. When a cause is removed, one would not be justified in looking for the effect of that particular cause. Just as a man clad in a ragged garment feels no more the disgrace of it when he has cast it off, so we, when we have cast off that dead unsightly tunic, typified by the "coats of skins" (Gen. iii. 21), shall fling all its belongings off with it, physical growth, birth, suckling, feeding, old age, disease, death and all such things.

It is folly, then, when we are to expect a different state of things in the life to come, to object to the doctrine of the resurrection on the ground of something that has got nothing to do with it. What has thinness or corpulence or any other condition, which arises in a nature that is ever in a state of flux, to do with the other life, stranger as it is to any fleeting, transitory passing thing like that? One thing only is required to bring the resurrection into operation—to have been born a man, or rather—to use the Gospel expression—"that a man has been born into the world" (John xvi. 21); the length or shortness of his life, the manner, whatever it may be, of his death are all irrelevant subjects of inquiry in connection with that transaction. As to the *how* and *when* of his dissolution, what do *they* matter to the resurrection? [1]

Consideration of the exact circumstances of a man's life belongs to another line of inquiry altogether. If he is to pass through (God's) just judgment on the things done or suffered in this life, it will be necessary for the Judge to scrutinise how well or

humanæ substantiæ ad Conditoris similitudinem sublimatæ omnia bona quæ naturaliter accepta peccato corruperat reparabuntur in melius (*De Vita Contemplativa*, iv., P. L. Tom. 59, p. 422).

[1] *Ib.* pp. 145–9.

ill a man conducted himself in good or evil circumstances. Length of life, disease, happy or unpleasant surroundings and so on, will all come into consideration. But whenever the time comes that God shall be bringing back our nature to its primal state, it will be useless to talk of such things, or to imagine that objections based on such things can prove God's power to be incapable of reaching the end He wills. His end is this and this only, when the whole of our race from the first man to the last shall have been perfected—some by the cleansing fire,[1] it may be—to offer to every one of us a share in the blessings which are in Him, which, the Scripture tells us, *eye hath not seen nor ear heard* nor thought ever compassed. But this is nothing else, as I at least understand it, but to be in God Himself; for the good thing, that is above hearing and seeing and imagining, must be that Good which transcends the universe.[2]

But one would more fully comprehend the futility and irrelevancy of those objections raised by you, if he were to try to fathom the depths of our Apostle's wisdom. When explaining this mystery to the Corinthians who, perhaps, were bringing forward the same objections to it as its impugners to-day, he proceeds to chide them thus: *Thou wilt say then to me, How are the dead raised up and with what manner of body do they come? Thou foolish one, that which thou thyself sowest is not quickened except it die; And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain; But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to each seed a body of its own* (1 Cor. xv. 35–8).

In that passage, it seems to me, he stops the mouths of men who show their ignorance of the fitting proportions in Nature, and who measure the Divine power by their own strength, and think only so much is possible to God as the human understanding can take in, but that anything beyond it surpasses also the Divine ability. For the man who had asked the Apostle, "how are the dead raised up?" evidently implies that it is impossible, when once the body's atoms have been dispersed, that they should be brought together again; and, this being impossible, and no other possible form of body, beside that arising from such a gathering together, being left—after the fashion of clever

[1] The saint goes on to indulge the larger hope, and to speak of the purgatorial cleansing as offering a solution of the problem of the sinful who die not fully cleansed. This section is omitted because it is not immediately relevant to our present subject.

[2] *De An. et Resurr.* pp. 149–52.

controversialists, he concludes the truth of what he wants to prove by a sort of syllogism, thus: If a body is a concourse of atoms, and a second assemblage of these is impossible, what sort of body will those get who rise again? This conclusion, involved seemingly in the artful contrivance of premises, the Apostle calls folly, as coming from men who failed to perceive in other parts of the creation the masterfulness of the Divine power. Omitting the sublimer miracles of God's hand, he convicts the objectors of lack of observation by means of objects very familiar to us all (ἐκ τῶν συντρόφων ἡμῖν καὶ κοινοτέρων ἐλέγχει τῶν ἐνισταμένων τὸ ἀνεπίσκεπτον).[1]

"Does not even husbandry," she asks, "teach thee that the man, who in calculating the transcendent powers of God, limits them by his own, is foolish?" Whence do seeds get the bodies that spring from them? What precedes this springing up? Is it not a death, a dissolution that precedes? Where, then, were the stalk, the ear, the full corn in the ear before that dissolution? And yet this result sprang from that grain; if that grain had not existed first, the ear would not have arisen.

Just, then, as "the body" of the ear comes to light out of the seed, and God's creative, artistic touch of power produces it all out of that single thing (τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου τοῦτο φιλοτεχνούσης), and just as it is neither entirely the same thing as that seed nor something altogether different, so (she insisted) by these miracles performed on seeds you may now interpret the mystery of the resurrection.

The Divine Power, in the superabundance of its Omnipotence, does not only restore (ἀποδιδούσης) us the body once dissolved, but makes great and splendid additions to it, whereby the human being is furnished in a manner still more magnificent. "*It is sown*," he says, "*in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown a natural* (animal) *body, it is raised a spiritual body*" (1 Cor. xv. 42–5). The grain of wheat, after its dissolution in the soil, leaves behind the smallness of its size and the peculiar quality of its shape, and yet it has not left nor lost itself; but still continuing in itself (ἐν αὐτῷ μένων) becomes the ear, which differs in many points from its former self, viz. in size, beauty, complexity, and shape.[2]

In like manner human nature detaches from itself in death all those peculiar enwrappings which it acquired by reason of

[1] *Ib.* pp. 152–3.

[2] *Ib.* p. 153.

its sensuous structure (διὰ τῆς ἐμπαθοῦς διαθέσεως), that "dishonour," I mean, and "corruption" and "weakness" and perishable characteristics (τὴν κατὰ τῆς ἡλικίας διαφθοράν) of youth or age; and yet it does not divest itself of itself. But it changes into the ear of corn, as it were; into "incorruption," that is, and "glory" and "honour" and absolute perfection; into a condition in which its life is no longer carried on in the ways peculiar to mere nature. Instead it had passed into an existence that is spiritual and free of sense.

For it is the peculiarity of the natural body to be always in a state of flux and to be always altering from its momentary condition and to be changing into another. Indeed these processes, we see, are not confined to man only, but are found in plants and animals as well. None of these processes shall be found remaining in that future life.

It seems to me that the Apostle's words harmonise in every respect with our own conception of the resurrection. They indicate the very same thing which our definition embodies, viz. "the resurrection is nothing short of the reconstitution of our nature into its original condition." In the resurrection we are born again into our original beauty.[1]

Within a few hours of finishing this prolonged discussion with her brother, the elect soul passed into the unseen in the act of raising her hand to her forehead to sign herself at the end of the devotions said at the Lighting of the Lamps. Hymn 18 in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* is a portion of those devotions. She passed surrounded by the Community of Dedicated Women of which she had been Foundress (conjointly with her widowed mother), Instructress and Superior.

S. Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem, 350–386.—We now reach the two last great names of the Nicene epoch, Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory of Nazianzus.

[1] *De An. et Resurr.* p. 156.
The saint follows up this definition of the resurrection, viz. as a return to the original ideal form of humanity, by a further elaboration of the cleansing of the imperfect "in the long course of ages" through the purgatorial fire, and so concludes. Except for the omission of unessential clauses here and there for brevity's sake, the words of the "Teacher" are adhered to. Much use has been made of the excellent translation published under Dean Wace's editorship in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd series, vol. v.

Cyril, born in or near Jerusalem about 315, was engaged when a young priest of thirty-two or thirty-three in preparing candidates for Baptism. It is quite possible that the famous Lectures, delivered in 347 or 348, had been used more than once before they were written out and published in book form. They form one of the most precious legacies of the early Church, giving us an example of the final stages of the long course of training and instruction, through which converts passed before their baptism. The course of eighteen Lectures was delivered in Lent in preparation for the baptism at the ensuing Easter. He takes the Articles of the Jerusalem baptismal creed in order. It is noteworthy that the Creed of the Church at Jerusalem already contained the concluding clauses of our present so-called Nicene Creed. The Creed of Nicæa [1] itself (325) ended with "I believe in the Holy Ghost." The clauses which follow that belong to the Creed known as the Constantinopolitan, and are substantially the same as those on which S. Cyril founded his three last Lectures, with one important difference in wording which will be noticed presently.

Three years after publishing these Lectures S. Cyril was made Archbishop of Jerusalem. He was thrice driven from his see through the bitter enmity of the Arians, who had the ear of the Byzantine Court during the reigns of Constantius and Valens (340–378, with the brief interlude of Julian's disastrous reign, 361–363). He was present at the Second General Council at Constantinople in 381, and according to Hefele shared the presidency [2] with the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria. He died in 386.

To return to the Catechetical Lectures, the eighteenth treats of the resurrection [3] of the body. The Jerusalem

[1] The original Creed of Nicæa was meant to be a guide for Bishops in the great Christological controversies, and was not meant to supersede the primitive baptismal Creed. As its enlarged form contained the usual concluding articles, it quickly became the baptismal Creed in the East. The West retained its own old form, which is substantially our existing Apostles' Creed.

[2] Hefele, *Councils*, II. p. 344.

[3] *The Testament of our Lord*, written about this time or a little later, has the unusual provision that the Resurrection was not to be taught until *after* Baptism, cf. Cooper and Maclean's edition, p. 128.

Creed expressed this doctrine in the traditional words, "the resurrection of the flesh" (σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις), soon to be changed at the Council of Constantinople into the, to us, familiar phrase, "the resurrection of the dead." The Acts or Minutes of the Council have been lost. So we have no record of the discussions which led up to this change, nor is it discussed by any contemporary writer now extant. So we are thrown back on the probabilities.

1. There is no hint that any change of doctrine was involved. If there had been, some sign of discussion in those highly disputatious times was to be expected.

2. The Church in Jerusalem had long ceased to have any Hebrew strain.[1] It was wholly Greek. The little esteem in which Greek pagan literature had been held by the first generations of Christians had long given way to a juster estimate of its intrinsic beauty. Leading Churchmen were accomplished classical scholars.

As it happens, the Greek word for "flesh," which is used in the New Testament and earlier Christian writers in the Hebrew sense of "complete human nature," is never used by the classical writers for anything but the visible, tangible, and perishable exterior of the human[2] organism. To speak of the resurrection of the "flesh" would convey to men accustomed to understand the word in this gross and limited sense an idea entirely different from the meaning of the word in the New Testament, in the primitive baptismal creed which was modelled on New Testament language, and in the continuous exposition of both Testament and Creed in the current teaching of the Church. Hence it may be inferred, that an assemblage of Greek Bishops, such as the Council of Constantinople was exclusively, decided to remove a verbal source of possible misunderstanding, and substituted the scriptural phrase,

[1] In S. Augustine's time, half a century or so later, there was still not a single Jew in Jerusalem, cf. *En. in Ps.* 72, para. 18, P. L. Tom. 36, p. 759; and *ib.* p. 1650.

[2] σάρξ is used almost exclusively for the exterior covering of the human body, but occasionally for the "flesh" of animals; cf. Galen, vol. xii. p. 310 (Kühn): ὡς ἡ σάρξ, πᾶν γὰρ ζῷον ἔχει ταύτην, and cf. Aristotle *passim*

"resurrection *of the dead*" [1] for "resurrection *of the flesh*."

Cyril is by some supposed to have promoted this alteration at the Council of Constantinople, and his Catechetical Lectures are alleged to bear witness to his dislike of the traditional phrase, but, as will be seen from the quotations below, he says nothing which had not been said over and over again by others.[2] S. Cyril begins Lecture 18 on "the resurrection of the flesh" thus :—

The hope of the resurrection is the root of all well-doing.

[1] An analysis of the New Testament passages in which "resurrection" and "the dead" are expressly connected may be found useful :—

1. "The resurrection of the dead," ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, Matt. xxii. 31 ; 1 Cor. xv. 42 ; cf. Acts iv. 2.
2. "Resurrection of (the) dead," ἀναστασις νεκρῶν, as in the Creeds, Acts xvii. 32, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 21, xxvi. 23 ; Rom. i. 4 ; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 21 ; Heb. vi. 2.
3. "Resurrection from (the) dead," ἀ. ἐκ νεκρῶν, Luke xx. 35 ; 1 Pet. i. 3.
4. (*a*) "The dead shall rise," ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί, 1 Thess. iv. 16 ; cf. Matt. xii. 41 ; and Luke xi. 32.
   (*b*) "raise up (the) dead," ἐγείρω (τοὺς) νεκρούς, Matt. x. 8, xi. 5 ; Mark xii. 26 (with article) ; Luke vii. 22, xx. 37 (with article) ; John v. 21 (with article) ; and Acts xxvi. 8 ; 1 Cor. xv. 15, 16, 29, 32 ; 1 Cor. xv. 35, 52 (with article) ; 2 Cor. i. 9 (with article).
5. (*a*) "raise from (the) dead," "rise from (the) dead," ἀνίστημι ἐκ νεκρῶν, Matt. xvii. 9 ; Mark ix. 9, 10, xii. 25 ; Luke xvi. 31, xxiv. 46 ; cf. John xx. 9 and Acts x. 41.
   (*b*) "raise up from (the) dead," ἐγείρω ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν, Matt. (but with ἀπό instead of ἐκ) xiv. 2, xxvii. 64, xxviii. 7 ; Mark vi. 14 (xvi. 14, W. & H.) ; Luke ix. 7 ; John ii. 22, xxi. 14 ; Heb. xi. 19 ; cf. the following, John xii. 1, 9, 19 ; Acts iii. 15, iv. 10, xiii. 30 ; Rom. iv. 24, vi. 4, 9, vii. 4, viii. 11, x. 7 ; 1 Cor. xv. 12 ; Gal. i. 1 ; Eph. i. 20 ; Col. ii. 12 ; 1 Thess. i. 10 ; 2 Tim. ii. 8 ; 1 Pet. i. 21.

[2] The second of Hort's masterly *Two Dissertations* (1876) contains all the main facts regarding the Council of Constantinople for which there is extant documentary evidence, and is unassailable in its main conclusions. He only mentions the alteration of the resurrection formula very briefly (p. 91) and does not discuss it in all its bearings.

Dr. Gibson (*The Three Creeds*, p. 169, note G) is not quite satisfied with Hort's ascription of the Constantinopolitan Creed entirely to a supposed revision of the Creed of Jerusalem by Cyril, and calls attention to its similarity to that in the Ancoratus of Epiphanius (374) and that in the Apostolic Constitutions (about 375). These preface the articles after "I (we) believe in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" with "I (we) ACKNOWLEDGE one Baptism," etc. ; "I (we) LOOK FOR the resurrection," etc., as does the Constantinopolitan Creed.

On the other hand, Dr. A. E. Burn, in his closely-packed book, *The Nicene Creed* (1909), defends Hort's theory against Dr. Gibson's criticisms (pp. 27–9).

It is remarkable that neither of these learned writers, nor others such

For the expectation of the reward nerves the soul to fine performance. Every labourer is ready to endure toil, if he sees his wage in prospect, but when men toil for nought their spirit grows slack as well as the body. A soldier who expects a prize is ready for war; but no fighter is keen on dying for a king who takes no notice, and bestows no rewards on labours. In like manner every soul that believes in the resurrection is naturally careful of itself; but disbelieving in the resurrection, it abandons itself to ruinous courses. He that believes that his body awaits the resurrection is careful of his robe, and does not defile it with uncleanness, but he that disbelieves in the resurrection gives himself over to fornication, misusing his body as if it formed no real part of him. Faith, then, in the resurrection of the dead is a great commandment and doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church; great and most necessary, and though gainsaid by many is warranted by the truth itself. Greeks gainsay it, Samaritans disbelieve it, heretics tear it to pieces. The gainsaying is manifold, the truth is uniform.[1]

He proceeds to give a careful *resumê* of the Christian rejoinder to the usual stock arguments brought forward by the various types of unbelievers. It is freshly worded, but adds nothing material to what had been already said by earlier writers, especially Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Methodius. His painstaking, simple, pedestrian style, devoid of all fine writing, is well suited for its practical purpose of instruction. Oratorical graces would be out of place. He turns on an objector and asks :—

But if according to thee there is no resurrection of the dead, why dost thou condemn robbers of graves? For if the body has clean perished, and the resurrection is past hoping for, why does the desecrator of the tomb undergo punishment? Thou seest that though thou deniest it with thy lips, there abides in thee an indestructible consciousness of the resurrection.[2]

as Lumby or Swainson or Lias, discuss the striking change from "believe in" to "acknowledge" and "look for" in the two last articles of this Creed. Nor do they observe that the earliest known use of "resurrection *of the dead*" in a creed-form is in the so-called Creed of Aphraates (*Dem.* i. 19), written thirty-seven years before the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius and forty-five years earlier than the Council of Constantinople. Hort was aware of Aphraates, for he quoted him in Westcott and Hort's *Greek New Testament*, vol. ii.p. 118.

[1] *Cat.* XVIII. i., P. G. Tom. 33, p. 1017.

[2] *Ib. c.* v., P. G. Tom. 33, p. 1021.

And whence in the beginning did men come into being at all, O ye Samaritans, most senseless of all men? Go to the first book of Scripture, which even ye receive: *And God formed man of the dust of the earth.* Dust is changed into flesh, and is not flesh (though fallen into dust) to be reconstituted flesh again?[1]

But especially mark this, how very pointedly Paul says: *For this corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal flesh put on immortality.* For this body shall be raised up, not remaining weak as now, yet raised this same body. Having put on incorruption it is fashioned anew, just as iron associated with fire becomes fire—nay rather it is after a manner known to the Lord, who raises men up.[2]

We shall all be raised up, therefore, having eternal bodies, but not all with bodies alike. If one is righteous, he receives a celestial body, that he may be able worthily to consort with angels.[3] . . .

Let us be careful, therefore, brethren, of our bodies, and let us not misuse them as if they did not belong to us. Let us not say, like the heretics, that this vesture of the body is alien to us. Let us be careful of it as it is our very own. For we must give account to the Lord of all things done through the agency of the body. Say not, no one sees me, nor think there is no witness of what you do. Assuredly there is often no human witness. But the Creator, an unerring witness, abides faithful in heaven, and sees the act; and the stains of sin remain in the body. For as when a wound has gone deep into the body, the scar remains even when it has been healed; so sin wounds both soul and body, and the marks of its scars remain in all.[4]

S. Gregory of Nazianzus, born 325, *died* 391.—This chapter closes with a few lines from the writings of the most attractive personality of that brilliant group which illuminated the interval between the Nicene and its sequel the Council of Constantinople. Gregory, son of Gregory, Bishop of Nazianzus, and of Nonna, the Monica of the Eastern Church, was born in or about the year of the Nicene Council, and lived to be one of the Presidents of that of Constantinople.

[1] *Ib. c.* xiii., P. G. Tom. 33, p. 1031.
[2] *Ib. c.* xviii., P. G. Tom. 33, p. 1040.
[3] *Ib. c.* xix., P. G. Tom. 33, p. 1040.
[4] *Ib. c.* xx., P. G. Tom. 33, p. 1041.

After his early education at the provincial capital, Cæsarea, and a period of travel, he entered the University of Athens, and had soon the joy of congenial companionship with a fellow-provincial, Basil. The friendship between these two is as famous as any in antiquity. Gregory's loyalty was sadly strained for a time in later life, when Basil, now Bishop of Cæsarea, appointed his life-long admirer and friend to a diocese remote, insignificant, and unattractive. It may well have been Basil's zeal for the spiritual welfare of Sasima, a wild and turbulent outpost, that led him to dispatch there his most cherished friend. But it failed to strike Gregory in that light. He had found it hard to forgive his own father for ordaining him Priest sorely against his will. But now his bosom friend, almost by force, consecrated him Bishop and exiled him. The breach between the two friends lasted for some time. Indeed it is doubtful if it was ever fully made up in this life. But the untimely death of Basil brought back all the old affection, as may be seen in the glow and fervour of the panegyric pronounced on him by Gregory in the Cathedral of Cæsarea.

Scholar, poet, ascetic, theologian, preacher, he can still from the cold page cast his spell over his reader in a way that Chrysostom himself cannot surpass. But he was easily daunted in practical affairs. When attending the Council of Constantinople he was elected Archbishop of the Capital. But he made an ineffective President of the Council and could not gain adhesion to his wise and tolerant plans for healing the great schism at Antioch. He allowed himself to be driven to resign his see by most frivolous charges, and retired to his native city, where he lived in seclusion for another ten years.

His references to the doctrine of the resurrection of the body come mostly in his funeral orations. They defy translation; but take this from his panegyric on his younger brother Cæsarius :—

> I am persuaded by the words of the wise that every fair soul beloved of God, when, freed from the bonds of the body, it departs hence, at once enjoys a sense and perception of the joys which await it; inasmuch as that which has darkened it

has been purged away or laid aside—I know not how one should describe it—and feels a wondrous pleasure and exultation and goes rejoicing to meet its Lord. It rejoices at having escaped from life here as from a grievous prison, and at having shaken off the cumbering fetters, by which the wings of the mind were held down. And so it enters on the enjoyment of the blissful heritage, of which it has even now some anticipation. Then a little later it receives back the kindred and kindly flesh,[1] which once shared with it in the pursuit of heavenly things. The soul receives it back from the earth, which gave it and then was again entrusted with it. Having received it back after a manner known to God, who bound them together and unbound them, the soul enters with it into the inheritance of the glory there. And as through their close union it shared in the body's labours here, so it bestows upon the body a portion of its own joys, gathering it up entirely into itself, and becoming with it one in spirit and in mind and in God, the mortal and mutable being swallowed up of life. Then (*i.e.* at the general resurrection) shall I see Cæsarius himself, no longer in exile, no longer laid on a bier, no longer mourned for, no longer pitied, but brilliant, glorious, uplifted, such as in my dreams I have often beheld thee, O dearest and most loving of brothers, whether pictured thus by my desire or by the very truth itself. . . . I am not afraid, even though this body of mine should utterly perish in dissolution and corruption, but I do fear that this glorious thing (*i.e.* the humanity) which God has formed—for glorious it is, if it walk uprightly, just as it is bereft of honour, if it keeps in sin—that this, in which is reason, law, hope, should be condemned to the same dishonour as irrational creatures are, and be no better after the sundering (of soul and body)—a thing which is the due of the wicked that deserve yonder fire.[2]

We take leave of Eastern teaching[3] here, and only

[1] σαρκίον, cf. *Corporis et animæ dulce consortium* of Herveius, quoted in Goulburn's Bampton Lectures; and cf. *caro mea amica*, S. Augustine, P. L. Tom. 38, p. 849.

[2] *Or.* VII. 21–3, P. G. Tom. 35, pp. 781–5.

[3] S. Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium (374), quoted by Theodoret, *Dial.* II., P. G. Tom. 83, p. 196, may be taken to sum up fittingly the sense of the Eastern Fathers generally: "After His Passion the Lord stood in the midst of the Apostles, the doors being shut, that thou mayest know that the natural body after being sown is raised a spiritual body, and that thou mayest not suppose the body which is raised to be a different body. . . . By shewing the prints of the nails he shews that it is this very body. By coming in when the doors were shut, that it has not the same qualities; the same body . . . but a changed body."

return to it briefly in Chapter XVI., pp. 230 f. Western teaching being necessarily more interesting to Westerns occupies the chief place from this point. The latter was subject to far keener attacks from unbelief and misbelief than was the Eastern Church, which suffered in other ways.

CHAPTER X

WESTERN TEACHING: FOURTH AND BEGINNING OF FIFTH CENTURIES

Post-Nicene

THE century following the Nicene Council saw an immense development of discussion regarding the various articles of the Creed, their philosophical bearings and implications. We of the present generation can read the books dating from that period with an understanding and sympathy begotten of a similar intellectual ferment, greater probably than was felt in any intervening age, not excepting the Reformation period itself. There is barely a point raised in present controversies that will not be found dealt with in extant writings of the fourth and early fifth centuries. It is a constant surprise, as one cons over those treatises, pamphlets, or letters afresh, to find how amazingly up-to-date they are. It is a pity that so many who indulge in theological speculation and controversy have not been at pains to acquaint themselves with the accredited writers of the golden age of Christian literature. They would rub their eyes as they discovered that so many of the so-called modern difficulties are as old as the hills, and were discussed by those earlier theologians with a freedom and a wealth of detail that has never been surpassed. If they should not find the reasoning in every case conclusive, or the solution of problems absolutely convincing, they would at least learn that there was no reluctance to face questions with candour, no tendency to rely upon authority alone, or to rule out reason in those high matters, nor any inclination to bar discussion.

And among the questions discussed the Resurrection of the Flesh held a prominent place.

In the West, four authors, whose works have come down to us fairly complete, stand out prominently in this as in other connections, Hilary of Poictiers, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, to give them in the order of their date and the ascending order of their importance. And let it not prejudice us against their testimony and the weight to be attached to it that succeeding generations have delighted to salute them as Saints. All four were men of the highest culture of their time, who accepted the Christian Faith in the prime of their life and powers, and gave up high and lucrative worldly positions to devote themselves to its study, practice, and propagation. A few extracts from their published teaching on the doctrine with which this treatise is concerned will give a fair idea of what was understood by the Resurrection of the Flesh in the Church of their day.

S. Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers, 353–368.—S. Hilary was elected Bishop of his native city of Poictiers when still a layman in or about the year 353. His works which have survived were published between that date and the year of his death, 368. Two quotations will suffice to give an idea of his teaching regarding the risen body. In the course of his comments on Psalm ii. 9, he quotes Jer. xviii. 4: *And when the vessel that was made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter, he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it.* S. Hilary, like many of the Fathers, applies Jeremiah's words figuratively to the resurrection :—

> That renewal of our rising bodies, which shall come to pass according to God's will, is understood to be meant. For as it pleaseth Him and is fitting in His sight, He will fashion anew the broken fragments, not out of some different stuff, but out of the identical stuff of their origin, imparting a form of beauty, well pleasing to Himself ; so that the rising again of our corruptible bodies into the glory of incorruption may not destroy their nature in an utter dissolution, but may transform it in the condition of its quality. For it will not rise another body, though

it will rise to other conditions, as the Apostle says: *It is sown in corruption, it will rise in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour, it will rise in glory; it is sown in weakness, it will rise in power; it is sown an animal* [natural] *body, it will rise a spiritual body.* It is a transformation, therefore, that takes place; it is not a complete wiping out that is spoken of. And when that which was rises into that which it was not, it has not lost its origin, but advanced unto (a state of) honour. Therefore, let us rejoice to be broken up like the potter's vessel, whether in this present time or in the future, in order that both now, after the fashion of the potter's vessel, having died and been buried with Christ in Baptism, we may walk in newness of life, and when the old man has been put away we may be reborn Christ's new man; and in the future, through this advance of our new birth, we may be made anew into that blessed form of our second refashioning, which is to God well pleasing.[1]

And again in his comments on Psalm lvi. 12: *For Thou hast delivered my soul from death: Hast thou not delivered my feet from falling? That I may walk before God in the light of the living,* occur these words:—

For He Himself is to Himself Master of His Resurrection; He Himself imparted to this Body, when it was dead and left within the tomb, the companionship of His Divine Nature. And therefore all that shall rise again do not acquire a body from external matter, nor is a nature of foreign origin and of outside causes bestowed upon them: but it emerges the very same, unto an advance in eternal splendour; and whatever is new in it is brought about by a transformation not by a fresh creation.[2]

S. Hilary returns to the subject again and again,[3] but the burden of his words always brings out the two leading points, the body after the resurrection is changed, and yet it retains its identity.

S. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, 374–397.—S. Ambrose, not yet baptised, was chosen Bishop of Milan in 374, when he was thirty-four years of age, and in the twenty-three years

[1] *Tract. c.* 41, in Psalm ii. 9, P. G. Tom. 9, pp. 285–6.

[2] *Tract.* in Psalm lvi. 13, *c.* 12, P. L. Tom. 9, pp. 361–2. Cf. P. L. Tom. 9, p. 467: "to change the corruption of our weak nature for the incorruption of a heavenly nature."

[3] See P. L. Tom. 9, pp. 361, 481, and 948–9.

of his episcopate published a number of works, characterised by a lofty eloquence and a serene and reasoned faith. He deals with the resurrection of the body at considerable length in many passages, but he does not easily lend himself to brief citation. In the beautiful sermon on the death of his brother Satyrus, the discussion on the resurrection of the body occupies twelve folio columns in the Benedictine edition of the Fathers (P. L. Tom. 16, pp. 1386–98). One striking passage may be quoted. He is using the processes of human generation to illustrate how a very glorious thing can spring from a very humble thing, utterly unlike it in appearance and qualities, and goes on to ask :—

From what is this head of mine fashioned, that wonderful countenance of yours, the Maker of which we do not see, only His work? From what are they fashioned for their various functions and uses? Whence the upright form, the lofty carriage, the power of doing things, the liveliness of feeling, the faculty of walking? Certainly the machinery of nature is unknown to us, but its results are known. *Thou once wast human seed, thy body is the seed of that which will rise again.*[1]

A little farther on in the same section of the sermon, he puts very forcibly the argument that the power exerted by God in the creation *of the world will not be overtasked by the raising* of the bodies that He once made to a higher state of existence. His concluding words are :—

Why should we be astonished that what once has been can be reborn, when we see the birth of what has not yet been? The astonishing thing is that though men do not believe in the resurrection, yet they take measures with a certain calm goodwill, in order that the human race should not die out, and they speak of souls crossing over and passing into bodies [2] to the end that the world may not perish. But let them themselves declare which is the more difficult, that souls should come into, or return to bodies; that they should reclaim their own again, or seek for new ones.[3]

In his commentary on S. Luke's Gospel, when he is

[1] *De Excess. frat.* ii. 60, P. L. Tom. 16, p. 1390.
[2] He is referring to the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls.
[3] *De Excess. frat.* ii., P. L. Tom. 16, p. 1391.

dealing with the words, *Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have* (xxiv. 39), he ends up :—

It was not by means of a bodiless nature but of a state of embodied resurrection that He passed through things impenetrable and closed. For what is touched is a body, what is handled is a body ; in a body, moreover, we shall rise again, for it is sown an animal [natural] body, it rises a spiritual body, but the latter more refined and rarefied (*subtilius*), the former grosser since it is still rendered dense by its condition of earthly contamination.[1]

In his exposition of Psalm i. 5, which in the Latin version reads, "*The wicked will not rise again* (resurgent) *in the Judgment,*" he discusses the resurrection at some length, and uses the following brief phrase of the resurrection of the righteous :—

For the righteous will be transformed into incorruption, the reality of the body still remaining.[2]

S. Ambrose does not disguise the fact that the resurrection of the body is not easily understood. He expresses the position thus :—

For the resurrection cannot be easily taken in except by the more advanced ; the privilege of this belief is reserved for the well-grounded.[3]

In this connection may be quoted a portion of his comparison between the renewal of vegetation in spring and the resurrection of the body after its winter of slumber in the grave :—

But it seems incredible to you that the dead should live again ; . . . many growing things, with ever so continuing a cheerfulness, are born from dry and sandy soil, since the earth herself supplies herself with moisture. Can it be, therefore, that she, that has been used to regenerate all things, becomes degenerate in the case of men ? And it is clear from this that we may not doubt but that it [*i.e.* the resurrection] is more in accordance with nature, than contrary to nature ; for it is in conformity

[1] *Expos. in Luc. lib. x.* 169, P. G. Tom. 15, p. 1940.
[2] P. L. Tom. 14, p. 993.
[3] *Expos. in Luc. lib. x.* 165, P. L. Tom. 15, p. 1939.

with nature that all things that are born should rise again; it is contrary to nature for them to perish.[1]

He warned against the attempt of certain heretics, who explained away the reality of the risen bodies of the saints, and insisted on that identity which abides through all the unimaginable and ineffable glory of their resurrection change. We may fittingly close our quotations from the great sage and saint, whom the still greater Augustine held in such profound and affectionate respect,[2] with the following:—

I wonder [he says] at certain heretics, who try to bring in the idea of a body made of air, that after the resurrection is gradually to be dispersed into thin vapour.[3]

In spite of this, S. Augustine [4] did not hesitate to apply the word "ethereal" to the risen body. This is a good example of the innocent use of a word which only becomes objectionable when used in the interests of heresy.

S. Jerome, 346–420.—S. Jerome was born in or about 346, and his literary activity lasted from 370 until his death in 420. He was the most learned man of his time, and, when not deflected by one of his many personal disputes, an open minded as well as an unwearied student. His great abilities marked him out for high office in the Church. It was even thought at one time that he would be the next Pope, but he died a plain priest. His harsh and overbearing temper and his genius for quarrelling with his friends affect his language in all matters of controversy, and distort his judgment of other men's words. Yet his services to Christian literature and especially in connection with the translation and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, entitle him to the gratitude of the Church. But he is at his weakest in questions of theology. This has to be borne in mind when we read him on the question of the

[1] *De Excess. frat.* ii. 57, P. L. Tom. 16, p. 1388. Cf. Tom. 14, p. 1128.
[2] See P. L. Tom. 44, p. 866, and Tom. 32, pp. 717, 719, 721, etc.
[3] *De Trin. Tract.* 35, P. L. Tom. 17, p. 575. The Ambrosian authorship of this Tractate is questioned.
[4] P. L. Tom. 40, p. 195. *Retract.* i. 26; P. L. Tom. 32, p. 626. S. Hilary speaks of the future life as *aeream vitam*, P. L. Tom. 9, p. 468.

resurrection of the flesh. He writes on that in his usual vehement style and allows himself to be drawn by controversialists into positive assertions on points of detail about the future life, of which we have no definite information, and can form no clear conceptions. If men try to throw discredit on the resurrection of the flesh by too curious questions, he is not content to confess ignorance or to put them aside. "Shall we need barbers or cut our nails, if our bodies are to be the same bodies as we had on earth?" "Shall we still be men and women, capable of marriage and actually marrying?" And so on. S. Jerome will insist on giving detailed and positive answers to these and suchlike questions, ransacking Holy Scripture for apposite and inapposite texts, instead of passing them by as mere attempts to ridicule the doctrine, and not inspired by a genuine desire for knowledge. S. Augustine points to the better way of treating such trifling.

So [he says] with regard to that body aforesaid, its great easiness of movement, its great swiftness, its great healthfulness, let not human frailty venture to define rashly and presumptuously. What we shall be like we shall know, when we have become so. Before we are so, let us not be rash, lest we become not that (which we hope for or suppose). It is human curiosity, which sometimes puts the question, and says to itself, Do you think the spiritual body will be the instrument by which we shall see God? [1]

S. Jerome, on the contrary, follows the will o' the wisp of speculative inquiry, and disports himself in a manner over which scoffers make merry. Still his one concern was to maintain the *reality* [2] of the resurrection (*resurrectionis veritas*), and to prove that the link of continuity between the natural body and the spiritual body is unbroken, and

[1] *Serm.* 277, 13, P. L. Tom. 38, p. 1264; cf. *Serm. ad Catech.* 12, P. L. Tom. 40, p. 652.

[2] *E.g.* when in commenting on Matt. xxii. 29, he speaks of our Lord taking food after His Resurrection "ad probandam corporis veritatem . . . ut resurrectionis fidem ciborum assumptio comprobaret." P. L. Tom. 24, p. 652. Cf. *ib.* p. 702, veræ carnis erit resurrectio; Tom. 23, p. 397, sic et nos post resurrectionem habebimus membra, quibus nunc utimur, easdem carnes et sanguinem et ossa; quorum in scripturis sanctis opera non natura damnatur.

that the " essential substance " of the natural body persists through death, and forms the " essential substance " of the glorified body after the resurrection. If he sometimes speaks of this identity of our present and future bodies in a way that, taken by itself, might imply a materialistic conception of the risen body, he is perfectly clear as to the change that will be effected at the resurrection.

Our being made like unto the angels does not mean the transformation of men into angels, but their advance in immortality and glory.[1]

Assuredly the essential substance of bodies at the resurrection will be the same as we now use, though the glory of them will be greatly enlarged.[2]

Nor in saying this do I take away the reality of their bodies, which, I admit, will rise again incorrupt and immortal, so that it is their glory not their essence that they change.[3]

In a few words he sets forth the whole mystery of the resurrection, that is the reality of the flesh and its increase in glory.[4]

They [*i.e.* " flesh and blood," 1 Cor. xv. 50] will not inherit the Kingdom of God, so long as they remain mere flesh and blood. But when corruption shall have put on incorruption and the mortal shall have put on immortality, and the clay of the flesh shall have been baked into porcelain, then that flesh, which before was pressed by heavy weight towards earth, shall receive the wings of a spirit and its new glory, which comes from transformation not from annihilation, shall wing its way towards heaven. Then will be fulfilled the Scripture: *Death is swallowed up in victory.*[5]

S. Jerome blames John of Jerusalem for always using the expression resurrection of the *body* instead of resurrection of the *flesh,* as in the Creed.[6] A good Hebrew scholar, he knew that in the Old Testament the word " flesh " had come to mean " complete humanity," body, soul and spirit, as it does predominantly in the New Testament.

[1] *Cont. Joan. Hierosol.* 31, P. L. Tom. 23, p. 400.
[2] *Adv. Jovin.* 36, P. L. Tom. 23, p. 272 *ad fin.*
[3] *Comm. in Isa. Proph. xviii.* 74, P. L. Tom. 24, p. 652.
[4] *Cont. Joan. Hierosol.* 34, P. L. Tom. 23, p. 403.
[5] *Ib.* 36, P. L. Tom. 23, p. 406.
[6] *Comm. in Ezech. xi.* 37, P. L. Tom. 25, p. 348.

S. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, born 354, *died* 430.—In turning to S. Augustine we find ourselves in a different atmosphere, though he and S. Jerome were contemporaries and in frequent correspondence. S. Jerome certainly writes beautiful Latin, but it lacks the charm, the limpid serenity which make the pages of S. Augustine such fascinating reading. Even in the heat of controversy his urbanity rarely deserts him. Though inferior to S. Jerome in scholarship—his Greek was but moderate, and Hebrew entirely lacking—the depth and range of his intellectual powers, his breadth of view, the balance and equity of his judgment place him amongst the few of all time to whom genius is attributed by general consent. He is the polished man of the world, in the best sense of that term, in contrast with Jerome the austere recluse. Born in 354 and not converted and baptised until 387, be began in the latter year his long and fruitful labours in the exposition and defence of the Faith, entering into rest in 430. His influence in his lifetime extended far beyond his Diocese of Hippo, and to this day his authority remains high in the estimation of theologians.

At every period of his life as a Christian, the importance of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was felt and expressed by him in books, sermons, letters, and in his commentaries on Holy Scripture. If the various passages in his writings, which deal with this subject, were to be printed in full without note or comment, they would make up a volume larger than that in the reader's hands. It is obvious that our extracts in illustration of his teaching can be no more than specimens, but they will be as representative as reverent care can make them.

Of the importance attached to the resurrection of the flesh by S. Augustine there can be no question. Not even S. Paul himself states it more unhesitatingly. If the dead are not raised, says the Apostle, then Christ did not rise again, our preaching is vain, the faith of Christians is vain, they are yet in their sins; the Apostles are false witnesses, and they that have fallen asleep in Christ have perished (1 Cor. xv. 12–19). S. Augustine in a sermon says:—

When, therefore, belief in the resurrection of the dead has been destroyed, the whole of Christian doctrine falls to the ground.[1]

He will not allow a man to call himself a Christian who doubts it :—

Since, therefore [he sums up in a sermon], it is plainly a part of our faith that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and so plainly, that whoever doubts it, is most impertinent in calling himself a Christian, the question is raised, etc.[2] . . .

Like S. Paul, too, he says that not only the unbelievers of his day shrank from this doctrine, but sometimes even a believer argues over it :—

And it is not heathen, or Jew, or heretic only that pulls a face, but sometimes a Catholic brother himself, when the promises of God are preached, and the future resurrection is proclaimed. And even yet he, though already washed with the water of eternal life, and bearing Christ's Sacrament, perchance says, Who is there hitherto that hath risen again ? [3]

Again and again he emphasises the vital importance of this article of the Creed :—

Let us faithfully hold that all flesh, *i.e.* the rational creation, shall rise again. This is the summary of our faith, and the thing which separates us off from unbelievers.[4]

The resurrection of the dead, which is the special faith of Christians ; this alone is the faith which divides off and separates Christians from all men ; the resurrection of the dead is the proper faith of Christians.[5]

And the whole preaching and dispensation through Christ is this, brothers, and nothing else, but that souls shall rise again, that bodies also shall rise again.[6]

He argues that the resurrection of the body is necessary

[1] *Serm.* 361, 2, P. L. Tom. 38, p. 1599.
[2] *Ib.* 362, 6, P. L. Tom. 38, p. 1614.
[3] *En. in Psalm.* lxxiv. *c.* 25, P. L. Tom. 36, p. 944.
[4] *Serm. ad Catech.* 6, P. L. Tom. 40, p. 650 ; cf. S. Maximus of Turin, P. L. Tom. 57, p. 439.
[5] *Serm.* 150, 2, P. L. Tom. 38, p. 808 ; cf. *Serm.* 215, 6, P. L. Tom. 38, pp. 1075, 1113, 1599 ; and Tom. 36, p. 1609.
[6] *Tractat. XXIII.* v. 6, P. L. Tom. 35, p. 1585.

to the complete happiness of the soul [1] in a passage too long to quote, which ends up with the words :—

Hence when (the soul), having been made equal to the angels, shall have got back again this body, no longer an animal (natural) but a spiritual body through its future transformation, it wil have reached the perfect measure of its nature, at once obeying and commanding, quickened and quickening, and endued with such ineffable freedom of action, that what had been a burden becomes a glory.[2]

Not Tertullian nor S. Jerome themselves are more decided in maintaining the identity of the future with the present body than S. Augustine. Of the Lord's risen Body, which he regards as the norm to which our bodies will be conformed at the resurrection, he says :—

Neither let us listen to those, who deny that the Body of the Lord rose again such as it was when laid in the tomb.[3]

But we must bethink ourselves, lest we be guilty of such arrogant daring as to say that the body through the glory of the resurrection loses not only its mortality and corruptibility, as it does, but also this identical [4] thing, viz. that it is a body, and (say that) it becomes spirit.[5]

Paulinus, in a letter of which S. Augustine approves, writes thus :—

Though the bodies of the Saints as they rise again will be transformed in the same manner as that in which the Body of the Lord appeared after His Resurrection, yet [he proceeds] they shall have all their members . . . tongues in their mouths

[1] Cf. S. Anselm, P. L. Tom. 159, p. 890 : "Indeed it is amply established that the souls of the saints which already possess the heavenly land, do not yet enjoy full felicity until they attain the incorruptibility of their bodies." Compare the prayer in the Burial Service : "that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory."

[2] *De Genes. ad litt. lib. xii. xxxv.*, P. L. Tom. 34, p. 484

[3] *De Agon. Chr. xxiv.*, P. L. Tom. 40, p. 304. Cf. the mediæval Abbot Gottfried's language, which at first seems to contradict this, P. L. Tom. 174, p. 955. The context shows that both mean precisely the same thing, but are for the moment looking at it from a different point of view.

[4] Cf. S. Fulgentius, "The flesh and soul of the righteous must be changed, but they must continue to be the same," P. L. Tom. 65, pp. 488, 508.

[5] *Ep.* 147, *c.* 22, P. L. Tom. 33, p. 620.

. . . with which to sing the Divine praises[1] . . . [quoting Psalm. lxxxiv. 4, *Blessed are they that dwell in Thy House; they will be always praising Thee.*

The classical passage on the resurrection occurs in the great work, *Of the City of God* (Book 22, chapters 12–30). After a lengthy discussion of all sorts of curious questions[2] which had been raised concerning the circumstances and details of the resurrection, he sums up in chapter 21 :—

Whatever, therefore, has been taken away from our bodies, either when they were alive or after death, shall be restored to them, and together also with that which remained in the graves shall rise again, transformed from the oldness of the animal body (*i.e.* the "natural body" of A.V. 1 Cor. xv. 44) into the newness of the spiritual body, robed in incorruption and immortality. Yea, even if the body has been all quite ground to powder by some severe accident or by the savagery of enemies, though it has been so diligently scattered to the winds or into the waters that not a trace of it is to be found,[3] yet in no way can it be withdrawn from its Creator's omnipotence, nay, *not a hair of the head shall perish* (Luke xxi. 18). The flesh shall then be spiritual,[4] but still it will be flesh, not spirit; just as the spirit when subject to the flesh was enfleshed, but still spirit, not flesh.[5]

And earlier in the work (Book 13, chapter 23) we have the words :—

For just as these bodies which have a living soul but not yet the quickening Spirit are called natural, yet are not souls but bodies, so are those risen bodies called spiritual, yet God forbid that we should for that reason suppose them to be spirits and not bodies. For being quickened by the Spirit they have the

[1] *Ep.* 94 (*a*), 6, P. L. Tom. 33, p. 350.

[2] The same and similar difficulties, partly raised by devout minds and partly by objectors and scoffers, are also dealt with, Tom. 33, p. 730; Tom. 38, p. 1140; and Tom. 40, pp. 272–3.

[3] That methods of burial or non-burial do not affect the resurrection of the body, see *Quæst. in Heptateuch.* i. 161, P. L. Tom. 34, p. 592; but that care in burying testifies to a belief in the resurrection, see P. L. Tom. 41, p. 27; cf. Prudentius, *Cath.* x. 45, P. L. Tom. 59, p. 880.

[4] Cf. S. Hildefonsus, "Though the bodies of the saints will arise spiritual, yet they will not be spirits." P. L. Tom. 83, p. 1230.

[5] P. L. Tom. 41, p. 783; cf. c. 24, *ib.* p. 92.

substance (the essential being) of flesh, but not its grossness and corruption.[1]

In a sermon preached at Eastertide S. Augustine discusses the meaning of the expression, "*the body of this death*" (Rom. vii. 24). He lays stress on the identity of the risen body with that which we now have :—

The Apostle answers (his own question), when his death was at hand—a debt which no man escapes. I do not lay down my body for ever, I lay it aside for a time. "So, then, you mean to return to the body of this death?" What is the answer? Nay rather let us hear his own words. "How," you ask, "do you return to a body, from which in such earnest tones you cried out to be delivered?" He answers: "I return indeed to a body, but no longer *a body of this death*." . . . Hear in what way he returns to a body, that is no longer *a body of this death*. Not because it will be a different body, but because *this corruptible* must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on *immortality*. My brethren, when the Apostle spoke of *this* corruptible, *this* mortal, he, as it were, touched his flesh as he spoke. It was not therefore another body that he meant. "I do not," he says, "lay down an earthly body, and receive a body made of air, or receive an ethereal[2] body." I receive the body itself, but no longer a body *of this death*.[3]

And in a sermon on the Ascension (Serm. 265, 6) he quotes 1 Cor. xv. 50, "*flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God*," and comments as follows :—

Why will they not inherit it? Is it because the flesh will not rise again? God forbid! The flesh will rise again, but what does it become? It is transformed and, while remaining the very same, it becomes a heavenly and angelic body. But have the angels flesh? Yes, but there is this difference, that yours is flesh that will rise again, that very same flesh of yours, which is buried, which dies . . . it must rise again its very self. . . . When it shall have been transformed, what will it become? Then it will be called a heavenly body, not mortal flesh.[4]

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xiii. 23, P. L. Tom. 41, pp. 395–6.
[2] On the other hand, an ethereal body is admitted to be a possible expression, P. L. Tom. 32, p. 626, and Tom. 40, p. 195.
[3] *Serm.* 256, 2, P. L. Tom. 38, p. 1192.
[4] P. L. Tom. 38, p. 1217; cf. *De Catech. Rud.* 32, P. L. Tom. 40, p. 309.

And in the Retractations he guards himself against being supposed, in his treatise on Faith and the Creed, to teach that the transformation of the earthly into the heavenly body is such that :—

neither will there be those limbs nor the essential substance of the flesh.[1]

A little further on (Book 1, 26) he qualifies a former statement in this wise :—

Where I said we must believe that angelic bodies, such as we hope we shall have, are most luminous and ethereal, it is a mistake if this is taken to mean the absence of the limbs, which we now have, or our being without the substance of the flesh, however incorruptible that flesh may be.[2]

And finally he corrects an impression that might have been conveyed by words of his in a book on *The Christian Combat*. He had written :—

This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality, for when this shall have taken place, there will be no longer flesh and blood, but a heavenly body.

On this he comments (*Retract.* ii. 2) :—

This is not to be taken as if there will not be the essential substance of the flesh. Rather the Apostle must be understood by the expression "flesh and blood" to have meant the actual corruption of flesh and blood, a corruption which certainly shall not exist in that Kingdom, where the flesh will be incorruptible.[3]

These samples of S. Augustine's teaching about the continued identity of the risen body carry with them clear evidence that conceptions of a gross or materialistic nature have no place in the Christian tradition as set forth by him. But still more definite testimony to this effect is scattered broadcast in his works. A few typical examples may be cited.

Take this letter in reply to Paulinus, who was very much exercised in his mind about questions which can only be

[1] *Retract.* i. 17, P. L. Tom. 32, p. 613.
[2] *Ib.* 26, *ib.* p. 626.
[3] P. L. Tom. 32, p. 631.

solved in the next world, and note S. Augustine's polite discouragement of profitless speculation on such topics, and his tone of wholesome agnosticism regarding matters that we do not and cannot know, and on which the Christian tradition as represented by the Holy Scriptures preserves a sacred silence [1] :—

But with regard to the resurrection of our bodies, and the future offices of their members in that state of incorruption and immortality, since you have asked me in turn what I think, hear a brief statement, which, should it not be sufficient, can be discussed at greater length if the Lord help me. It must most firmly be held—and as to that the meaning of Holy Scripture is to the point and clear—that those visible and earthly bodies of ours, which now are called animal (natural), shall at the resurrection of the faithful and righteous be spiritual. But beyond that, since we have no experience of it, I do not know how what a spiritual body is like can be either understood or conveyed.[2]

His saying, "what we shall be like in the future life, we shall know when we get there," has been already quoted (p. 167).

With this caution agrees his language in a sermon to Catechumens :—

Let us not be curious [3] to investigate that which Apostles were by no means able to express. At all events, let no one seek to know from me that of which I know I am ignorant, unless perchance in order that he may learn to be ignorant of what cannot, he knows, be known.[4]

[1] At the same time he does not stiffly refuse to learn from others what they may have to say about the nature of the spiritual body, if only a controversial and dogmatic temper is avoided. Tom. 33, pp. 618, 623.

[2] *Ep.* 95, 7, P. L. Tom. 33, p. 355.

[3] Cf. S. Chrysostom: "The life when it comes destroys and does away with the corruption; the corruption, I say, not the body. 'And how does this come about?' says some one. Inquire not. God does it. Be not too curious. This, too, is why Paul adds: '*Now He that hath wrought us for this very thing is God*'" (*Hom.* x., on 2 Cor. v. 1–4, P. G. Tom. 61, p. 468. See also *Hom.* xli. on 1 Cor. P. G. Tom. 61, p. 357.) "So when he says: '*thou sowest not that body which shall be,*' he does not say that one substance is raised up in place of the other, but that it is improved, that it is made more glorious." S. Chrysostom abounds in similar teaching, but his glowing rhetoric gives few examples sufficiently crisp and brief for citation in a work of this compass.

[4] *Serm. ad Catech.* xii., P. L. Tom. 40, p. 652.

He speaks of the Jews believing in the resurrection of the dead, but disapproves of their materialistic ideas concerning the activities of the future life.[1]

He draws a clear distinction between the raising of Lazarus to ordinary gross earthly life and the resurrection of our Lord Himself, which he never tires of preaching as both the source and the model of ours.[2] For the rest he confines himself, after the manner of Scripture, to general terms and those free from any suggestion of grossness or materialism in speaking of the risen body :—

For we ought to believe, he says, that we shall have bodies of such a sort that where we wish to be and when we wish it, we are there.[3]

The flesh will rise again incorruptible, the flesh will rise again without flaw, without blemish, without mortality, without burdensomeness, without heaviness. That flesh which brings thee torment, will afterwards be thine ornament.[4]

For they shall be no longer living for men but for God, when they shall have been made equal to the angels. Therefore flesh and blood shall be transformed, and shall become a body heavenly and angelical. *For the dead shall rise incorruptible and we shall be changed ;* so that both on the one hand it may be true, that the flesh will rise again, and on the other, that *flesh and blood will not inherit the Kingdom of God* may be true also.[5]

What our bodies are to be like, the Apostle Paul declares in the words : *It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption ; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power ; it is sown an animal (natural) body, it is raised a spiritual body.* This incorruption, power, glory, the quickening Spirit will make us equal to the angels, as the Lord Himself deigned to promise, so that we live with them in eternal life, in one and the same immortality and in our everlasting fatherland. And in that fatherland Christ Himself will be our eternal life.[6]

Hereafter what you wish for will be granted to the full, when death shall have been swallowed up in victory, when this mortal

[1] *Serm.* 362, 18, P. L. Tom. 39, p. 1623. Cf. Peter Lombard, P. L. Tom. 191, p. 1689.
[2] *Ep.* 102 (*a*), 3, P. L. Tom. 33, p. 371.
[3] *Serm.* 242, 5, P. L. Tom. 38, p. 1140. Cf. Abbot Godefrid, P. L. Tom. 174, p. 294.
[4] *Serm.* 241, 3, P. L. Tom. 38, p. 1131.
[5] *De Agon. Chr.* 34, P. L. Tom. 40, p. 309; cf. Tom. 38, p. 1217.
[6] *Serm. ad Catech.* 23, P. L. Tom. 40, p. 651.

body having risen again is transported into the condition of angels,[1] and attains on high to a heavenly quality.[2]

Perhaps S. Augustine's conception of our future state reaches its highest expression in a sermon (No. 166) preached on the text Eph. iv. 25. In the peroration, after speaking of God wishing to make us gods, not in nature but by His gift, Who became Man for our sakes, he ends up with the words:—

Therefore putting away falsehood, speak ye truth, so that even that mortal flesh of yours which ye have from Adam may its very self (a renewing of the spirit coming first) deserve renewal and transmutation at the time of its resurrection; and, as it were, the whole man having become divine (literally, having been deified), may cleave to its everlasting and unchangeable reality.[3]

[1] The general belief of antiquity that angels were corporeal should be borne in mind; cf. Gennadius, P. L. Tom. 58, p. 984.
[2] *En. in Psalm.* cxliii, *c.* 9, P. L. Tom. 37, p. 1862.
[3] *Serm.* 166, *ad fin.*, P. L. Tom. 38, p. 909.

CHAPTER XI

WESTERN TEACHING: FIFTH TO EIGHTH CENTURY

IT is a far descent from the spaciousness, loftiness, and breadth of S. Augustine to any of his successors in the centuries immediately following, even to a Leo and a Gregory. For them as for us he is the greatest name in early Western Christianity. Where he is clear and distinct and consistent, as he is in his teaching on the resurrection, future ages in the West have been content to accept his guidance, and to translate him to their contemporaries in the idiom of their own times. The subject-matter remains unchanged. No determining accession of information or of light on the old information is to be expected this side the grave, but experience, meditation, and study bring out new points of view. Above all, the ever-increasing knowledge of the world around us, of our relationship to it, of our own physical and spiritual composition, and of the ever-lessening distinction between matter and spirit require fresh adjustments of language, if the old truth is to be conveyed intelligibly, without addition or diminution, to each generation as it arises. Here comes the difficulty. Under colour of adjustment of language there can conceivably lurk tendencies which aim not so much at expressing the old truth in the tongue of the day as at explaining it away.

Two things kept the theologians of the centuries coming after S. Augustine from giving way, consciously or unconsciously, to this danger. Scientific knowledge continued for several centuries to be practically the same as his; and they all wrote in a language no longer in a state of flux

by reason of current usage. Students are familiar with the great and many misunderstandings which arise from the fact that no two languages possess words exactly and rigorously synonymous. Idioms in one language with clear-cut meanings can only be conveyed approximately in another language. This is true of languages like Latin and Greek, which are as closely akin as English and Dutch. Lamentable indeed are the quite needless difficulties which have aggravated the division of Eastern from Western Christendom, owing to the human inability to express accurately the precise meaning of crucial phrases in another language. The writers who followed S. Augustine in the West were not hampered by this trouble. They all used the same Latin tongue, which now was rapidly becoming a literary rather than a spoken language, and so was less liable to changes of meaning and connotation as time went on.

The writers from the middle of the fifth to the beginning of the eighth century naturally group themselves round two great names. S. Leo and those who were personally and directly influenced by him: Cassian, S. Peter Chrysologus, S. Maximus of Turin, Gennadius, and Julian of Arles. These cover the period from S. Augustine's death to the beginning of the sixth century. S. Gregory and his train of followers and admirers bring us to the end of the seventh century.

Fortunately, a little space will give a fair idea of their method of expressing the great truth of the resurrection of the flesh. S. Augustine had written so copiously on every aspect of the subject, and was so generally accepted as the great authority, that there was no need for them to write at length.

S. Leo, Bishop of Rome, 440–461.—Hence S. Leo (Bishop of Rome, 440–461) has only one extended exposition of the doctrine, and that coming in the ordinary course of his pastoral activities. In a sermon preached on Easter Eve occurs this passage:—

Our Lord's Resurrection was not the end of His Flesh, but

the transformation of it, nor by the increase of its power was its essence[1] destroyed. Its quality changed, but its nature did not cease to be; and that body which could be crucified became incapable of suffering; that which could die became immortal; that which could be wounded became incorruptible. And with justice Christ's Flesh is said not to be known in that state in which it had been known; for there remained in it nothing capable of suffering, nothing weak; so that it was the very same as regards its essence and yet not the very same by reason of the glory.[2] . . . For us a beginning was made of our resurrection in Christ from the time at which in Him Who died for all, He, the Type of all our hopes, passed on ahead. We do not hesitate in distrust, nor do we hang back in uncertainty of expectation; but, having received an earnest of the promise, we descry with eyes of faith what is yet to come; and, rejoicing at the advance in our nature, we already possess that in which we believe.[3]

The Pontiff's lovely, terse Latin is the despair as well as the admiration of a translator. But even a clumsy attempt to reproduce the sense in English will show how clearly he sets forth the identity of the Risen Lord's transformed Body with that which hung upon the Cross. In the wonder and greatness of that glorious change we by faith and hope are sharers. He the Type, the firstborn from the dead, on whom all our hopes are fixed, will see us through.

Cassian, born 360, *died* 435 (*about*).—Cassian, born in the East and an extensive traveller, spent the latter part of his life in the West, and thus forms a link between Eastern and Western Christendom. He occupied, too, a midway position between S. Augustine and Pelagius on the questions of Free-will and Predestination. He founded and presided over a convent at Marseilles and was a prolific writer. His principal work that has come down to us was published ten

[1] *Substantia*=that inner something which made His Flesh to be flesh. Tertullian is the first Christian writer to use *substantia* in this philosophical sense. See the illuminating disquisitions on the use and meaning of *substantia* by Dr. T. B. Strong in *Jour. Theo. Stud.*, Jan. and Oct. 1901, and Oct. 1902.

[2] *I.e.* the glorious transformation that had taken place.

[3] *Serm.* 71, 4, P. L. Tom. 54, p. 388.

years before S. Leo assumed the mitre.[1] It speaks of Scripture calling the resurrection a kind of begetting, as momentous in the changes it brings as are the differences between the fœtus in the womb and the child after birth:—

For [he says] as begetting creates life, so does the resurrection beget to life. And in consequence the resurrection, too, itself is called a re-begetting.[2]

S. Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna, 433–454.—S. Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna, died midway in Leo's pontificate, leaving a great name behind him for sanctity, and as a pastor and preacher. A sermon of his on our Lord's Resurrection connects the Transfiguration and the descent of the angel to roll away the stone, and interprets the glory and splendour of the former as

giving a representation of the appearance and fashion of our

[1] It is possible that this term is an anachronism. But the evidence of Aphraates, now available in Graffin's superb edition, *Patrologia Syriaca*, vols. i. and ii., with Dom Parisot's thorough and scholarly Introduction and *App. Crit.*, etc., shows that an official headdress for Bishops was in use early in the fourth century in so remote a country as Persia. Aphraates in the Pastoral and Synodical Letter, which forms his *Demonstration XIV.*, addressed from the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons assembled to their brethren of Seleucia-Ctesiphon—that very Ctesiphon now written in blood on many British hearts—speaks of there having been found among them a certain brother of ours, "whose brows were encircled with the taga" or tiara. This can have been none other than the redoubtable Papa, first-Catholikos or Primate of the Church in that region, recently deceased, and therefore left unnamed, because Aphraates has some severe criticisms to make (*Dem.* xiv. *c.* 8, lines 16 and 18, *P. Syr.* vol. i. p. 588). Those similarly adorned, referred to on p. 649, line 16, are also most probably Bishops, but may be secular rulers.

The *Taga* is an official headdress of dignity, cf. *ib.* p. 112, line 15, of the "royal crown" laid aside by the king of Nineveh (Jon. iii. 6, where R.V. has "royal robe"); *ib.* p. 280, lines 6 and 18, p. 420, lines 18 and 20, of the *crown* or *diadem* of "our glorious King" our Lord Jesus Christ; *ib.* p. 1000, lines 22 and 23, of Kings; and *ib.* p. 1032, line 14, of the "crown" bestowed by his king on a Provincial Vice-regent.

The high-priestly frontlet (*τὸ πέταλον*) is spoken of by Polycrates as having been worn by S. John (Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 31, P. G. Tom. 20, p. 280, and 24, *ib.* p. 495; cf. Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.* 45, P. L. Tom. 23, p. 693. Epiphanius states that ancient authors attributed this badge of office to S. James also, the Lord's brother (*Hær.* 294, P. G. Tom. 41, p. 386). The high-priestly frontlet implies the mitre to which it was attached. For a brief sketch of Aphraates' work, *v.* Ch. VIII.

[2] *De Incarn. Verb.* v. 7, P. L. Tom. 50, p. 113; cf. S. Prosper, P. L. Tom. 51, p. 412, and Lanfranc, P. L. Tom. 150, p. 322.

resurrection; because [he says] they that through Christ rise again are changed into the glory of Christ.[1]

And he begins another sermon on the Resurrection as follows:—

Since *the whole hope of the Christian faith is built on the resurrection of the dead*, we have caused the lesson from S. Paul to be read to you to-day, etc.[2]

Gennadius, died 496.—Gennadius, a priest of Marseilles, who survived S. Leo by some thirty years, has a passage of considerable interest in the profession of faith that opens his *Book of Church Dogmas*:—

There will be [he says] a resurrection of all the dead. . . . And if that which falls dead is said to rise again, our flesh therefore rises again in reality, as it falls dead in reality. And the transformation of our bodies will not be after Origen's fashion, that is to say, that there should be another new body instead of flesh;[3] but the same corruptible flesh which falls dead both of just and unjust will rise again incorruptible flesh, such as can suffer punishment for sins or for its merits remain in eternal glory.[4]

The writer is bent on emphasising the continuity that subsists between the risen body and the present. It was common ground with the ancients that created beings all had bodies of some sort, including the angels.[5] Gennadius was concerned to maintain that the bodies which men were to possess after the resurrection would not be an entirely fresh body, newly acquired and having no link of connection with the former body. The latter opinion he regarded as cutting at the root of all morality, in so far as our body is concerned in moral or immoral acts. But in what exactly the link of connection consists, and how it is maintained

[1] *Serm.* 74, P. L. Tom. 52, p. 411; cf. *Serm.* 77, *ib.* p. 419.
[2] *Serm.* 118, P. L. Tom. 52, p. 552; cf. S. Maximus of Turin, P. L. Tom. 57, p. 439.
[3] A complete misunderstanding of Origen's teaching. He himself speaks on the next page of the "transforming of the quick" at the last day.
[4] *De Eccl. Dogm.* 6, P. L. Tom. 58, p. 982.
[5] Cf. Gennadius to this effect, P. G. Tom. 58, pp. 984, 1162, 1265, 1483, 1515, and 1627.

between the time of dissolution and restoration, on these questions he does not speculate. In common with Latin writers generally he declines to follow Origen in his surmises on the subject. Like them, too, he probably owes his unfavourable estimate of Origen's teaching on this point to S. Jerome's somewhat jaundiced version, rather than to original study of the great man's own words.

Julian of Arles, died early in the Sixth Century.—Two brief extracts from the little known author Julian,[1] a priest of Arles, though born in North Africa, may fittingly close our study of the Leonine period. Julian wrote freely at the very end of the fifth century, but his work on the Contemplative Life has alone survived. Chapters 4 and 11 of the first book can be read in full with much profit. These two sentences from it must, however, suffice :—

> The human creature will be so perfect that it cannot be changed any further for better or for worse. And all the good things of his human substance, *when that has been refined into the image of his Creator* (Gen. i. 27), those good things naturally bestowed which he had destroyed through sin will be restored and for the better.[2]
>
> In fact, from our bodies, when they have been gifted with immortality, sluggishness is to be removed not completeness, necessity not free-will; so that without any delay in time or hampering by weight, they are there where they wish to be; and the body, now become spiritual, follows without any hindrance to whatever place the spirit, having attained perfect equality with the bliss of the angels, should wish to go.[3]

S. Gregory the Great, 590–604.—We now come to S. Gregory, justly named the Great, who with those that confessedly drew their inspiration from him, brings us to the close of the seventh century. He occupied the Roman chair from 590 to 604 and bequeathed a great bulk of priceless writings to future generations. His works fill five volumes of the Benedictine Edition—commentaries on Holy Scripture, letters, homilies, liturgical disquisitions, etc.

[1] A favourite name in early Christian circles. The *Dictionary of Christian Biography* contains notices of 115 Julians.

[2] *De Vita. Contem.* i. and ii., P. L. Tom. 59, p. 422.

[3] *Ib.* p. 427.

His references, however, to the resurrection of the body, are mainly incidental. He bears witness to the continued existence of difficulties even amongst the faithful on this subject, and confesses that once upon a time he had himself been a doubter. In a sermon preached in the basilica of S. John on Low Sunday he says towards the end :—

But because there are some who are uncertain about the resurrection of the flesh, and because we teach it more rightly when we meet the hidden questionings of your hearts, a few words must be said by us regarding the very faith in the resurrection. For many doubt about the resurrection, as even we ourselves once did, who, etc.[1]

And in a homily on Ezek. xl. 28–30 :—

It is too sad and extremely lamentable that, as we know, some are standing here in church who are doubtful of the resurrection of the flesh.[2]

Gregory of Tours, writing a little earlier, had lamented a similar laxity in France, and gives examples of discipline having had to be exercised on some clergy who had yielded to scepticism regarding the resurrection.[3]

S. Gregory the Great's own teaching should, therefore, be of the utmost interest. For example, he takes Job xiv. 15—" Thou shalt call and I will answer "—and applies it mystically to the resurrection :—

In that transformation the Lord calls and man answers, because, before the splendour of the Incorrupt, man is shown incorrupt after his corruption.[4] . . . And with regard to that transformation it is written : *When He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.*

He is content here to use the word " transformation," but on Job xix. 25–27 he deals at considerable length with the subject. We only have space for some leading sentences :—

The resurrection indeed, which He showed in His own person

[1] *Hom. in Evang.* ii. 26, 12, P. L. Tom. 76, p. 1203.
[2] *Hom. in Ezech.* viii. 6, *ib.* p. 1030.
[3] *Hist. Franc.* x. 13, P. L. Tom. 71, pp. 543 *et seq.*
[4] *Moral. in Job*, Lib. xii. 18, P. L. Tom. 75, p. 995.

He promised to us, because the members follow the glory of their Head.[1]

He adduces natural phenomena as prophecies of the resurrection, working out eloquently the Pauline parallel of the plant springing from an insignificant seed :—

Since we have been created rational beings, we ought to be able to infer the hope of our resurrection from the very appearance of things and from contemplation of them.[2]

He introduces an inquirer, asking what he will be like when he rises again :—

I want to know [he says] whether I am to rise some sort of different thing perhaps, or made of air, or in that body in which I shall die. He rejoins :—But if I rise again in a body made of air, I who rise will not be I. For how is it a true resurrection, if it cannot be true flesh? Therefore plain reason suggests that if it will not be true flesh, without doubt it will not be a true resurrection. For it cannot rightly be called resurrection where that which fell does not rise again.[3]

Then he gives a most interesting glimpse of a discussion on this subject which some years before he had had with Eutychius the Bishop of Constantinople.[4] Eutychius spoke of the future body as being impalpable and more rarefied (*subtilius*) than the winds and air. The future Pope maintained that our body would be certainly rarefied by reason of spiritual power, but still palpable by reason of the truth of its nature, quoting S. Luke xxiv. 39 : *Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me having.* As Gregory did not speak Greek and Eutychius did not speak Latin, the controversy had to be carried on through interpreters. Any one who has tried to discuss a theological question under these circumstances soon realises how difficult it is to come to close quarters. Probably these great disputants were much nearer to complete agreement than they thought. The book of Eutychius on the

[1] *Moral.* Lib. xiv. 68, P. L. Tom. 75, p. 1075.
[2] *Ib.* p. 1077.
[3] *Ib.* p. 1077.
[4] *Ib.* pp. 1077–9. See Dr. Dudden's account in his *Gregory the Great*, vol. i. p. 142.

resurrection has not come down to us, and no account of the discussion from his point of view is extant. The words of Eutychius, when conveyed to Gregory through the interpreter, certainly seemed to gloze over the identity of the risen body and to minimise its reality. It is equally possible that Gregory's exposition of the sameness of the natural and spiritual body may on the lips of the interpreter have seemed to imply the continuance in the higher life of the hampering physical conditions of the earthly life.

Be that as it may, S. Gregory's own words, written in calmness and free from the heats of verbal controversy, are conspicuously free from materialistic suggestion. The section in his *Moral Reflections on the Book of Job*, which follows on his reminiscences of the old discussion with Eutychius, runs thus :—

> For if, as certain followers of errors think, the body after the resurrection will not be palpable, but the invisible tenuity of the body will be called " flesh," though it is not the substance (essence) of the flesh, assuredly it is one man who dies and another who rises again. . . . But we, following the belief of Blessed Job, and believing that the Body of our Redeemer was truly palpable after the Resurrection, maintain that our flesh after the resurrection will be at once the same, and yet dissimilar ; the same through its nature, dissimilar through glory, the same through its reality, dissimilar through its power. So it will be rarefied, just because it is incorruptible. It will be palpable because it will not lose the essence of its true nature.[1]

There is no reason to doubt that Eutychius would have readily subscribed to this carefully balanced statement, especially if he understood the meaning of " substance " and " essence " in the mouth of a Latin. The substance or essence of a thing is that inner something which makes it to be what it is under all changes of external circumstances and appearances.[2]

Two other Spanish Bishops, who wrote towards the end of the seventh century, may be quoted, so as to give a fair

[1] *Moral.* Lib. xiv. 77, P. L. Tom. 75, p. 1080.

[2] This passage of S. Gregory is quoted by Taio, Bishop of Saragossa, in his book of *Authoritative Opinions*, written some forty years after the saint's death. P. L. Tom. 80, p. 1230.

idea of the methods of stating the doctrine of the resurrection which prevailed in that important province.

S. Hildefonsus, Bishop of Toledo, 657–667.—S. Hildefonsus, who was forced by the king to accept the See of Toledo in 657, is most uncompromising in asserting the identity of the risen with the former body. But this is how he concludes his argument; quoting verbatim from S. Augustine (P. L. Tom. 40, p. 274) :—

> The bodies of the saints, therefore, will rise again without any flaw, without any deformity, as they will be without any corruption, heaviness, or awkwardness, and in them there will be felicity proportioned to their facility of thought and action. And it is on this account that they are called spiritual, since beyond doubt they are still bodies, not spirits. But . . . it will not be flesh, but body, because there are said to be bodies celestial also (1 Cor. xv. 40). . . . But as far as its substance is concerned it will even then be flesh. And it is on this account that even after His Resurrection the Body of Christ is called Flesh (Luke xxiv. 39). Moreover it was for this reason that the Apostle says: *It is sown an animal (natural) body, it will rise a spiritual body*, since the harmony between soul and body will then be so great, owing to the quickening of the obedient flesh by the spirit, without need of any nutriment, to such an extent that nothing belonging to us will fight against us. As we shall have to put up with no foe without, so neither shall we with foes within.[1]

S. Julian, Bishop of Toledo, 680–690.—S. Julian, Bishop of Toledo from 680 to 690, wrote a great deal, but only a few of his works have come down to us. The chapters of his *Prognosticon* on the resurrection of the body are mainly a cento from S. Augustine, S. Jerome, and his namesake Julian of Arles. He insists on the continuity between the body of this life and the next, but is perfectly clear about the transformation through which the earthly body must first pass. His standpoint may be gathered from one of his citations from S. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 30) :

> S. Augustine, sorely afraid of expressing a definite opinion about the movements of the risen body, speaks thus :—" What

[1] *Lib. de Cognit. Baptismi, c.* 87, P. L. Tom. 96, p. 143.

shall be the movements there of such bodies I do not dare to define, because I am not so much as able to picture them in my thoughts. Yet both movements, and rest, whatever it will be, will be seemly just as will be the very look of them, in that place where what is unseemly will not exist. Certainly where the spirit shall wish to be, there forthwith will be the body, nor will the spirit wish for anything which can misbecome either itself or the body." [1]

S. Augustine continued to be quoted, as having said the last word on the Christian doctrine of the resurrection, in the centuries immediately following. There is a good example of this in one of the books of Jonas, Bishop of Orleans (died 843 or 844). His *Layman's Guide* is largely made up of quotations from S. Augustine and other authorities, including excerpts from the Enchiridion of S. Augustine on the resurrection of the body.[2]

Even more emphatically is this true of Alcuin, the most considerable scholar of his time (735–804). An Englishman, pupil of Egbert of York, he was the foremost European theologian and teacher of the eighth century. Yet he is the learned and accomplished dispenser of the garnered wisdom of his predecessors, rather than an original thinker. He was, in fact, the lecturer and schoolmaster of his age *par excellence*. His most considerable discussion of the resurrection of the body comes in a volume addressed to Charles the Great on *Belief in the Holy Trinity*, and consists almost entirely of deftly woven extracts from S. Augustine.[3]

[1] *Prognost. c.* 53, P. L. Tom. 96, p. 520.
[2] P. L. Tom. 106, p. 266.
[3] *Ib.* Tom. 101, p. 52.
For Alcuin, see Bishop Browne's *Alcuin of York*, and Professor West's *Alcuin* in Heinemann's series of " Great Educators."

CHAPTER XII

WESTERN TEACHING: NINTH TO TWELFTH CENTURY

THE ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries produced few theological writers in the West, and none of the first rank. The Church was carrying on her double work of caring for the faithful within her fold, and of gathering in those without. This work is mostly done by quite ordinary men. The few brilliant intellects that flash on the world from time to time are, as it were, extras, something beyond the merely competent on whom the world depends for the humdrum "daily round and common task." [1] Only the great day will do justice to the commonplace folk, who have borne and bear the burden and heat of the world's everyday work.

Though no writers of the first class appeared in the West between the eighth and the twelfth centuries, a vast amount of missionary work was carried on. At the close of the eighth century a large part of Europe was still heathen, the Netherlands having been won to the faith only towards the century's close. It took twelve centuries to complete the conversion of the peoples of the late German Empire, and Prussia still remained heathen at the end of the eleventh century, though Adelbert had garnered some converts there as early as 997. The peoples of Sweden were gradually brought into the Church during the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries. Conversions in Norway began in the tenth century, but the whole country did not profess Christianity until the beginning of the twelfth century. Denmark first yielded converts in the ninth century, but

[1] Cf. a charming lecture on this theme by William James in his *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*, pp. 265–301, esp. on pp. 275, 280, and 288.

it took close on four centuries of slow, patient work to complete the conversion of this kingdom and its outlying dependencies. The first conversions in Poland came as late as the latter part of the tenth century, and Hungary did not finally embrace Christianity until century eleven. Russia does not come into our view, as it was evangelised by the Eastern, not the Western, Church.[1]

This slow, slow, patient work was carried out, in addition to the still slower and harder work of bringing the nominally converted peoples of the Christian portion of Europe into a fuller understanding and more diligent practice of their professed religion. All this went on in a time of great political confusion. Our own generation knows something of the glow of missionary enterprise, and something, too, of the toils and disappointments as well as of the heartening successes. It knows, also, that for the most part the work is not done by great geniuses, but by average men and women touched by the divine fire. This common experience should give us a better understanding of and a greater sympathy with the Ages commonly called Dark. Dark, yes, to the secular historian, who naturally desires great outstanding figures to adorn his pages. The Churchman knows that much virtue may reside in plodding dulness, and strongly suspects that its value in heavenly currency may overpass much more brilliant performances. Yet the six writers about to be quoted are by no means to be despised. Besides them, there are quite a number of others of respectable eminence who do not happen to contribute anything on the subject with which we are particularly concerned in this treatise.

Two of the six are closely connected with Britain, for though of foreign birth they did their finest work as Archbishops of Canterbury, Lanfranc and Anselm.

Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mayence 847–856.—Rabanus Maurus, the earliest of the six, has this connection with Britain, that he was a pupil of Alcuin, one of the greatest theologians of British birth. His surname of Maurus was

[1] This bald statement may be read in expanded form in Dr. C. H. Robinson's most interesting and readable volume, *The Conversion of Europe*.

given to him by his great master, indicating that as Maurus had been the favourite disciple of Benedict, so Rabanus was Alcuin's own best-loved pupil. He was considered the most learned man of his time. His writings on sacred subjects are mostly commentaries on Holy Scripture. Born in the last quarter of the eighth century, he began his active work as a teacher and writer early in the ninth century, and carried on his literary labours up to his death in 856, after a nine years' tenure of the Archbishopric of Mayence, his native city. There is a homily of his on the resurrection of extraordinary interest, which unfortunately is too long to quote in full.[1] In this he lays great stress on the future bodies being " celestial " :—

> The bodies of those that rise again are celestial, but before they die or rise again are terrestrial, so that as Christ is celestial their bodies on that account are called celestial.

Quoting S. Paul, *There are both bodies celestial and there are bodies terrestrial, but the glory of the celestial is one and the glory of the terrestrial is another* (1 Cor. xv. 40).

In an earlier homily, preached on the Wednesday of the seventh Sunday after Trinity, he is dealing with our Lord's words, *For they are equal unto the angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection* (Luke xx. 36) :—

> Equal unto angels and sons of God [he repeats], for they have been renewed by the glory of the resurrection, and are without any fear of death, without any stain of corruption, without any impulse of their earthly state, so making every one enjoy the perpetual Vision of God. And any one who desires then to reach that equality with the angelic dignity, must now stoop down to the least of the brethren.[2]

It would not be easy to state the Christian tradition more clearly and yet freer from all exaggeration or controversial animus. The identity is implied and the greatness of the changed condition quietly emphasised, as would naturally happen when preaching to people who doubted neither.

[1] Hom. 137, P. L. Tom. 110, pp. 409–11, in a series of sermons on the Epistles and Gospels, delivered on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and on the great Saints' Days.

[2] P. L. Tom. 110, p. 289.

Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt 840–853.—A fellow pupil with Rabanus, under the instruction of Alcuin, became in later life Bishop of Halberstadt, Haymo the Benedictine, not to be confused with a later and better known Haymo, the Englishman, who holds a distinguished position amongst the scholastic authors of the thirteenth century. The earlier Haymo died in 853. The first of his three books, *On the Love of the Heavenly Country*, is a beautiful and moving meditation on all we know of the conditions of the future life.

When men reach it after finishing their good works they will be like unto the angels.

He selects the choicest passages from S. Prosper, S. Augustine, S. Gregory the Great, the Venerable Bede, and weaves them skilfully into his glowing prose, adding little fresh but following faithfully on the lines of the acknowledged mouthpieces of the Church.

Otto, Bishop of Vercellæ, 924–961.—This last remark applies also to Otto of Vercellæ, a learned theologian of the following century, who has left us an excellent commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians amongst his works. His comments on the fifteenth chapter are worthy of the attention of scholars, but do not lend themselves easily to quotation or summary, and so must be left to be read by the leisured.[1]

Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury 1070–1089.—And even Lanfranc himself contributes no original thought on the subject of the resurrection of the body. In his Commentary on 1 Cor. xv. he follows the well-beaten track. His comparison of the resurrection to a "sort of birth" conveys a clear picture of the great change involved, but that, too, is borrowed from men of old.[2]

S. Bruno, died 1101.—Nor did S. Bruno, the founder of the Grand Chartreuse, see any need in his day for fresh expression of the Church's faith regarding the resurrection of the body. It had long ceased to be called in question

[1] P. L. Tom. 134, pp. 395–408 for 1 Cor. xv.
[2] *Ib.* 150, p. 322 (on Col. i. 13).

by any who professed to be guided by the Church. Consequently when he deals with the doctrine in his Expositions on S. Paul's Epistles, it is always briefly and incidentally. The identity of the risen body and yet the glorious change, that is to pass upon it, are both assumed rather than dwelt on.[1]

S. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury 1093–1109.—The eleventh century in the West closes with S. Anselm,[2] who unites in his own person fidelity to the old traditional teaching with an entirely new method of presentation and exposition. He is often reckoned the first of the Schoolmen, whose distinguishing trait was the fearless use of reason, not so much to discover religious truth as to exhibit its inherent reasonableness. In his closely reasoned treatise on the Incarnation—*Why did God become Man?*—he touches on the resurrection quite by the way, at the opening of Book II. The reference to it is reached by these steps. God has created man, and created him in a state of righteousness in order that man should find his blessedness in enjoying God for ever. Man frustrated the Divine purpose for him by falling into sin. But it is inconceivable that God should permit the self-will of man permanently to defeat His purpose. Consequently it lies upon the wisdom and love of God to devise a method whereby His banished could be restored to Him, and to enter on the blessedness which He had designed for them. That must be achieved consistently with His holiness and justice. God's method was that His own Son should assume the very nature which had failed and bring it triumphantly through the temptations and trials to which it had formerly succumbed. Means were appointed whereby each member of fallen humanity should have the opportunity of being incorporated into His Son's flawless humanity, become identified with it by faith, and so be relieved of the entail of the past. It was by grace that he was to be transformed gradually into the

[1] See especially his truly admirable running comments on 1 Cor. xv., P. L. Tom. 153, pp. 202–214.

[2] Dean Church in *St. Anselm*, the ripest fruit of his philosophic mind, sets all this and more out in his own unapproachable style.

actual likeness of that original nature, which God made for blessedness :—

And from this a future resurrection of the dead is clearly to be inferred. For if man is to be perfectly restored, he must be restored to such a state as he would have been in, if he had not sinned. Since therefore if man had not sinned, he would have been transformed to a state of incorruptibility with the same body that he had, it is necessary that, when he is restored, he should be restored with his own body in which he lives in this life.[1]

It is the work of God alone when the dead rise again.[2]

He says in another connection, and in a sermon on the interpretation of Hebrew names :—

And Seth, which is translated "placed," or position, because he is now *placed* in that kingdom of supernal blessedness, from which he had long been an exile. It is also translated "seed" or "resurrection," because his body was *sown* an animal (natural) body, but that same body of his will rise again a spiritual body.

And a little further on :—

Then comes Seth, which means "place" or "resurrection," because he now *places* (*i.e.* lays aside) the body which at the end will *rise again*. And then the perfected man will be refashioned into his ancient and better state.[3]

S. Bernard of Clairvaux, 1096–1153.—S. Anselm was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1093 to 1109, thus over-lapping the beginning of the twelfth century, which is the proper preserve of the Schoolmen, but there is still one striking personality, who though he lived right through the first half-century of scholastic activity, yet belongs to the previous age of theological development. S. Bernard, the oracle of the contemporary Church, was born in 1096, and died in 1153. The tender sublimity of his writings shows little if any trace of the new movement in thought which distinguished his day. Consequently a brief notice of his

[1] *Cur Deus Homo?* ii. 3, P. L. Tom. 158, pp. 401–2.
[2] *De Concept. Virg.* xi. P. L. Tom. 158, p. 445.
[3] *Hom. et Exhort.*, P. L. Tom. 158, pp. 642–3; cf. S. Maximus of Turin, *Cont. Jud.* i. in C. H. Turner's careful recension, *J. T. S.* xx. p. 293.

teaching on the resurrection of the body is more in place at the close of our review of the pre-scholastic centuries than in its proper chronological order. It is, however, really singular how little can be extracted from his works about the resurrection of the body.[1] In one of his sermons he speaks of belief in the bodily resurrection,[2] but gives little indication here or elsewhere as to any definite theory of what is meant by "bodily." Perhaps a clue may be found in the seven qualities ascribed to the risen body in a treatise formerly included amongst his works but now believed to be by a contemporary Cistercian: "beauty, speed, strength, freedom, health, pleasure, durability," on each of which the writer enlarges most eloquently. Take this sample of his comment on the gift of "speed":—

> For those who will be with God shall have as great swiftness of motion as the sun's ray, or the eyes of a clear-sighted man. The sun truly as soon as he rises on the earth in the East, forthwith darts his ray to the West; in like manner the ray of the eye, as the eyelid opens, is directed afar, to the sky or any whither, provided there is no obstacle between; so of a surety will our bodies transfer themselves with the greatest ease wherever they will. When they shall have become spiritual, and, after the likeness of the Angels, feel not weight nor heaviness, they will transfer themselves whither they will with the utmost ease.[3]

Gottfried, Abbot of Admont in Styria, beginning of the Twelfth Century.—A few words from one of the sermons of Abbot Gottfried (or Godefrid or Godfrey) will close this brief exposition of pre-scholastic teaching. For though he flourished in the first half of the twelfth century, he, like his contemporary S. Bernard, belongs of right to the preceding age. He was one of the earlier Abbots of the Benedictine House of Admont in Styria, which was founded in 1074. His sermons, which are of great merit, fill a thousand folio columns of the Benedictine edition of the

[1] His lack of success in his Mission to the Albigenses, who denied the resurrection of the body on Manichæan principles, may have tended to make him emphasise the identity rather than the transformation of the risen body. See p. 204.

[2] P. L. Tom. 183, 210.

[3] *Ep. ad Frat.* ii. 5, P. L. Tom. 184, p. 356.

Fathers. Preaching on the Feast of S. Lawrence, he uses the following words towards the end of his sermon :—

If any man serve Me, him will My Father honour. When, then, will God the Father honour His Son's servant, if it be not when at the general resurrection He will marvellously and in an ineffable manner glorify the body which now rots in the earth? It is rightly said *will honour*, for He will clothe with eternal incorruption the body which is now corruptible, and the soul receives back the body in such sort that it no longer as now lusts against the soul but there remains a stable basis between them of perpetual peace to all eternity. Therefore, if the Lord were to restore us a body such as we now bear about with us, the receiving of it could confer no joy on us but rather grief.[1] But, as it is, we believe and know for a truth that He will fashion the body of our humiliation like to the Body of His splendour, and hence it is that souls long for the recovery of that which they know is to be so honoured.[2]

[1] Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *De An. et Resurr.*, P. G. Tom. 46, p. 137.
[2] *Hom. Fest.* 62, P. L. Tom. 174, p. 955.

CHAPTER XIII

WESTERN TEACHING: THE SCHOLASTICS

1st Stage—Twelfth Century

THE first stage of Scholasticism partially coincided with the period referred to at the close of the previous chapter. S. Bernard, the last of the Latin Fathers, represents the older method of entire deference to authority; the no less famous Abelard the newer method of calling upon tradition to justify itself at the bar of free inquiry.

Abelard, born 1079, *died* 1142.—Abelard's works concern themselves so little with our subject that there is no occasion to enter on a discussion of the troubled life of this brilliant and unquiet soul, born before his time. He was no heretic, though his insistence on the rights of the human reason, even in theological matters, shocked some of the best spirits of his age, and seemed to them an irreverent invasion of the sanctuary. The dry white light of his intellect might have provided warmth as well as illumination, if he had met with a more sympathetic treatment at the hands of his intellectual inferiors in high places. Strife, even disinterested strife for truth, is the deadly enemy of devotion. It must be confessed, too, that his practical judgment was far from being as reliable as his eminence in intellectual matters would lead one to expect. Much of his life troubles arose from his blunders in dealing with his ecclesiastical superiors.

This devoted though misunderstood son of the Church refers to the resurrection of the body in the following terms:—

Without doubt it is clear that it cannot be called a rising

again, unless it have the body's substance, which suffered a fall in death.[1]

Once more we find ourselves asking what he understood by the " substance " of the body.

Peter Lombard, born about 1100, *died about* 1164.—Abelard's pupil and discriminating admirer, Peter Lombard, amongst other works wrote four books of Sentences, as they were called, *i.e.* systematic compendiums of theology, founded on Holy Scripture and the Fathers with reasoned comments of his own. He steered a middle course between the old and the new methods of presenting Christian doctrine, between a stiff adherence to authority and an unbridled reliance on reason. " The Master of the Sentences," as Peter came to be called, was quoted, after a little hesitation at first on the part of some, as himself an acknowledged authority, until the sixteenth century, and is worthy of respect to-day.

Peter expressly declares that he cannot answer satisfactorily all the questions which men were used to raise about the resurrection and the manner in which the dead rise again.[2] In spite, however, of this disclaimer he ventures on details regarding the restoration of the body that do not appeal to the modern mind, just as S. Augustine, and others before and after him, lent themselves to satisfy the curious on questions for which we have no sufficient data to justify dogmatic conclusions. He finishes with a quotation from S. Augustine :—

> So the bodies of the saints will rise without any blemish, without any deformity, since they will be free from anything that corrupts, weighs down, or hinders them ; their facility (of action) will be in proportion to their felicity : because they are called spiritual though without doubt they are bodies not spirits.[3]

And he adds on his own account :—

> Of the substance of which the flesh of man is created nothing will perish, but the natural substance of the body will be restored

[1] *Expos. Fid. in Symbol. Athan. c.* P. L. Tom. 178, p. 631.
[2] *Lib. Sent.* iv. 43, 1, P. L. Tom. 192, p. 943.
[3] *Ib.* 44, 3, P. L. Tom. 192, p. 946, from Aug. *Enchir*, 91.

by the gathering together of the particles formerly dispersed. The bodies also of the saints will rise without any flaw resplendent as the sun, all blemishes which they had here being pruned away.[1]

It must be admitted that this is a lean harvest from a careful examination of the fifty portly Benedictine tomes, which contain the principal writers of the West in the twelfth century. Though it was a time of widespread heresy on the subject of the resurrection of the body, there is no clear recognition of the possibility that the contemporary method of presenting the doctrine may have laid itself open to misconception. The continuity of the risen body—a fundamental and essential truth—is asserted as firmly as it ought to have been. But the assertion is dull and mechanical, and no effort is made to forestall misunderstanding.

The complementary truth, which is equally part of the Christian tradition, is allowed to sink into the background. There was no Hilary, nor Augustine, nor Leo, nor Gregory, to state the two elements of the great truth side by side. It was not that the transformation of the natural body into the spiritual was denied. Far from it. It can still be found hidden away in the writings of the devout and sincere opponents of the Albigensian[2] heresy. But it was not prominently put forward as it ought to have been. Their remedy for false teaching was to set forth one part—an indispensable part, but not the whole of the truth—in the crudest possible terms, regardless of the materialistic meaning to which their language lent itself, whether they intended it or not. A well-instructed Churchman, one who believed in the Real Presence of the Risen Body of the Lord in the Eucharist, would understand their language in a high and spiritual sense. But instead of the Real Presence being used to shed light on what a risen body was like, there was

[1] *Ib.* Exactly how he figured to himself "the natural substance" of the human body we do not know, but however materialistic the words may sound in English, the Latin conception of "substance" is not necessarily gross.

[2] For this movement, see pp. 203-5. Cf. pp. 64-5.

a danger that the unguarded grossness of terms used concerning the resurrection of the body might react on the conception of the Real Presence formed by outsiders. This danger should have been foreseen. Once a wrong conception of that kind had taken root it proved a fruitful source of alienation from the Church—a result which has not exhausted itself yet. It is impossible to refrain from a lament of this sort when a survey of the literature of the twelfth century drives home the impression that the defenders of Christian truth in that age were sadly lacking in imagination, in the power of seeing with the eyes of their opponents. Controversy at all times is a poor way of arriving at truth. But to convince an opponent, it is not enough to use language intelligible to one already convinced. There must be some of that penetrating imagination which can figure to itself what the language is likely to mean in the ears of the opponent, and to choose one's words accordingly.

A few references, which may be useful to the student, are given below to three of the more important lesser lights of the century.

See Hugh of S. Victor, *De Sacr.* ii. 17, 13–21, P. L. Tom. 176, pp. 601–6. He was of a noble family in Saxony, born 1096. In his eighteenth year he was drawn to the Convent of S. Victor, outside Paris, by its fame for learning. Though he died in his forty-fourth year he left behind a fine literary output, comprising commentaries on Holy Scripture together with mystic, ascetic, and dogmatic works. "There are arguments of the philosophers about the 'agility' of the body, for they will never explain how greatly the body differs in its present state and in its future immortality."

Robert Pullen, an Englishman and one-time Archdeacon of Rochester, died 1147 a Cardinal of the Roman Church. He was the first to compile a volume of "Sentences," but it was soon superseded by the completer work of Peter Lombard. He treats of the resurrection of the body, Book viii. 15–18, P. L. Tom. 186, pp. 982–990. He quotes Phil. iii. 20 to show the nature of the risen body: *we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the Body of His Glory.* "In the Transfiguration he showed an example of its future splendour. A clearer and finer example of the resurrection could not be found."

PETER OF BLOIS, *Serm.* 20 C, P. L. Tom. 207, p. 619: "Our first resurrection is from sin, that sin should no longer have dominion over us. The second resurrection will be that of the body, when this mortal, animal, ignoble, earthy body of clay will be conformed to the Body of Christ's splendour." Peter, born in Brittany, spent twenty-six years of his life in England, and was employed by our Kings on important embassies. His letters, sermons, and tractates are well worthy of study.

ALANUS DE INSULIS, called the Universal Doctor, born in Flanders, became a Cistercian, was Abbot of Larivoir (Ripatorium) in the Province of Champagne, for a few years occupied the See of Auxerre (Antissiodorum) in Burgundy, which he resigned to return to Clairvaux. He attended the Lateran Council of 1180, wrote much in a very agreeable Latin, and composed a useful reply to the Albigensian heresies, in which there is a section relating to the resurrection of the body, *Contra Hæret.* i. 23–6, P. L. Tom. 210, pp. 324–6: "He who created all things out of nothing, and fashioned the human body from clay, can refashion the body that has been reduced to dust; and that, too, into a better condition. . . . The smelter by much manipulation extracts silver from foul and formless earth without changing the 'matter' of the earth. The Supreme Workman by his own authority will refashion our human bodies. We say, too, that the identical body which has been reduced to ashes will be refashioned, because the 'matter' and 'substance' of it remain. For although the human body puts off human likeness, yet neither does the essential body cease to be, nor does it lose any of the essentials which belong to the body. And so, that identical body will be glorified in the day of Judgment. . . . With regard to the 'grain' which 'has died' in the ground, we say that from it several grains are produced, not just the single grain that it was, nor does the whole 'substance' of the grain pass into the substance of another grain, but partly into the substance of the ear, partly into the substance of the stalk, partly into the substance of the leaves and roots, but the whole human body which is reduced to ashes will be the whole human body which will rise again in the day of Judgment. The whole, I say, according to the truth of human nature."

CHAPTER XIV

WESTERN TEACHING: THE SCHOLASTICS

2nd Stage

WITH the thirteenth century began one of the most brilliant periods in Christian intellectual development. That wonderful efflorescence of human genius under the eagerly sought guidance of the Holy Spirit equals, if it does not surpass, other great outbursts of intellectual energy such as that of the Alexandrine School with Origen as its greatest name, of the Athanasian circle combined with Basil and the Gregories, and in the West the Augustinian School itself.

Albertus Magnus, S. Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus need fear comparison with none before or since. They contribute so little, however, in the way of fresh elucidation of our own subject that we should not be justified in devoting much space to them in this treatise, were it not for one thing. They stereotyped for five hundred years the method of presenting to the faithful the resurrection doctrine, not only among those who adhered to the Papacy in the convulsions of the sixteenth century, but among those who broke loose from it. The tendency of Western theology in contrast to Eastern had been, as has been already pointed out,[1] to emphasise the identity of the risen body with the earthly body, sometimes to the obscuring of the complete transformation, which changes the natural into the spiritual. In the second period of scholasticism, which reached its apogee in the thirteenth century, the tendency was further accentuated. With all reverence for those great leaders,

[1] See p. 199.

and for the greatest of them, S. Thomas himself, we venture to lament their shortsightedness in this respect.

Face to face with the Albigensian denial of the body's resurrection they, like the earlier Scholastics, were content with stating the Church's doctrine in the bluntest and curtest terms, which threw one element of it into high relief and almost ignored the other. It was doubtful policy to parley at all on details of Christian doctrine with men who maintained that there were two creative principles in the Universe, a good God who made the Angels and other pure spirits such as they conceived the souls of men to be, and another Creator who made the material world and with it all things evil, including men's bodies.

The Unity of God the Creator is so fundamental to Christian theology that to discuss subsidiary matters before that is settled is waste of time and energy. And at that stage the very Incarnation itself is subsidiary, much more the Christian doctrines that flow from it.

The utmost that can profitably be done before an agreement is reached in the controversy on which all else depends, is to take pains to remove all loopholes for misconception regarding what such and such articles of the Faith really mean. But discussion of their truth is strictly preposterous until the fundamental point is determined. It would save much fret and useless worry if this were borne in mind. Otherwise there is no common ground on which a Christian and an Albigensian can meet.

The recrudescence of Manichæism pure and simple in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was not a Christian heresy so much as a rival religion. Muhammadanism had more in common with Christianity than had Albigensian Manichæism. Muhammadan and Christian both believe in the Unity of God. True, the Christian further believes that in the Unity there are Eternal Distinctions of Personality. In the Unity of God he worships the Holy and undivided Trinity. He worships Eternal Love, who is not a monstrous monotony of self-love. He worships the Eternal Love of the Eternal Father for the Eternal Son in the Unity of the Eternal Spirit,—that Spirit who

proceeds from the Father in eternity and from the Father and the Son in time. But belief in the Unity is prior to and essential to belief in the Trinity. Consequently Christian and Muhammadan have a common starting-point.

The Albigensian, if he were to be converted to Christianity, had first to be brought back to acknowledge that there is only One God. Then would come the revelation of the Trinity in that Unity; then the mystery of the Incarnation of the Eternal Son; and then the subordinate mysteries, which depend on, which spring from, the Incarnation—the Sacraments, the resurrection of the flesh, in a word, the remaining articles of the Christian Faith.

If you read the refutations of Albigensian doctrine [1] by Alanus de Insulis, extraordinarily lucid and convincing as they are to a Christian, you will find him devoting as much space and skill to the Albigensian rejection (say) of marriage, as to their assertion that there were two Creators; and that the second creator was the author of all material things, including the body, and that the body, therefore, and everything connected with it, such as marriage, was irredeemably evil and unclean.

That devout and scholarly writer may have seen the futility of discussing the Christian ideal of marriage with men whose bedrock principle made marriage necessarily an unholy thing; but if he saw how futile the discussion was, he does not betray it. This air of unreality runs through all extant controversy with the Albigensians, and may partially account for the failure of the beloved S. Bernard himself to make much impression on those survivals from the third century. He nearly broke his heart over them.

The treatment of the resurrection of the body by the Scholastic writers is affected throughout by this circumstance. We do not get from them an orderly exposition of the doctrine as addressed to the faithful. That was already provided by accredited writers, and did not seem to

[1] See *Cont. Hæret.* Lib. i. and ii., P. L. Tom. 210, pp. 307–400. Alanus is referred to because we possess a record of his discussion with the Albigenses.

them to require doing over again. Their statement of the doctrine is in direct or indirect controversy with virulent "heretics," and suffers from one of the inevitable defects of controversy—a conscious or unconscious hardening of language.

It was for the express purpose of rescuing the people from the prevalent Albigensian "heresy" that S. Dominic founded the Order of Preachers in 1215.[1] Preaching had been sadly neglected, and luxury and worldliness had too commonly lowered the estimation in which ecclesiastics were held. Even an Order like the Cistercians had succumbed to the enervating atmosphere. It was to remedy this deplorable state of things that the Saint, filled with a love of souls, directed all his energies. He gathered round him a band of ardent disciples, who carried the Gospel message far and near.

S. Thomas Aquinas, born about 1225, *died* 1274.—Within a few years of Saint Dominic's death (in 1221) was born, at the little town of Aquino in Italy, one who not only conferred undying lustre on the Dominican Order, but was one of the greatest minds that the human race has produced. S. Thomas Aquinas takes a place by right of commanding intellect with Plato, Aristotle, Origen, and Augustine. Though he died under fifty, worn out by his unceasing labours, he left behind works which fill seventeen folio volumes of the edition of 1570.

This is not the place to attempt a general review of his theological teaching, but one feature of it demands a few words. His fearless appeal to reason set a new current streaming through the veins of the Church, which had and has incalculable results in the region of religious thought. The intrepid boldness which led him to impress Aristotle into the service of Christian theology sets one gasping even now. No wonder it excited some alarm at first.

Aristotle had only recently become known again to the Western world. He had come by way of the Mosque and the Synagogue.[2] He had been translated into Arabic for

[1] Formally confirmed Dec. 22, 1216.

[2] Maimonides, the great Jewish contemporary of S. Thomas, makes

the Muhammadan Academies and reached Spain in that tongue, from which at first he was translated into Latin by Jewish interpreters.[1]

It was sufficiently daring to use the work of a pagan philosopher, introduced by Moslem and Jew, as a mould into which to pour Christian doctrine, fused in the white heat of his ardent intellect. But more, it was in some sort a reversal of the policy of his predecessors, who had favoured Plato, not Aristotle. S. Augustine, *e.g.* quotes Plato some scores of times, and only refers to Aristotle three or four times at most, and similarly with the Greek Fathers, notably the most purely classical of them all, S. Clement of Alexandria.

It need scarcely be said that S. Thomas does not follow Aristotle blindly, as neither did his Franciscan fellow-Aristotelian and keen critic, Duns Scotus,[2] but both shape their philosophical teaching largely on his lines, and throw their theological teaching into modes of expression laid down by him.

Whether this annexation of the subtle Greek has been an unqualified gain to Christian doctrine may be questioned. In two particulars this doubt may find tentative expression here.

Definitions of "substance," *e.g.* were taken over from Aristotle and incorporated into Christian theology, which are free from all materialism to those who are trained in philosophical language, but almost inevitably suggest it to untrained minds. They therefore may become, and indeed have been, stumbling-blocks to the simple folk, who after all are the majority of Christ's flock, and deserve some consideration, when learned philosophers draw up definitions of Christian doctrine. The doctrine of the Real Presence, which the Aristotelian term "trans-substantiation"

much use of Aristotle. D. Yellin and I. Abrahams, in the last chapter of their *Maimonides*, discuss the Jewish philosopher's influence on Aquinas and other Scholastics. Further investigation of this interesting subject should yield valuable results.

[1] It was S. Thomas who secured later a Latin translation of Aristotle direct from the Greek.

[2] It is a moot point whether Ireland, Scotland, or England gave us the "Doctor Subtilis," as Duns Scotus was called. At all events he belongs to the British Isles and was a Lecturer at Oxford in the infancy of the University, *d.* about 1310.

was intended to express, is the immemorial teaching of the Church both East and West. It had been impugned by the Albigensians—naturally enough from their standpoint that matter is necessarily evil—but why saddle the Church for all time with a difficult word?

The second particular is more subtle. Aristotle denied individual immortality, and consequently his whole system has no outlook for men beyond this present life. Of course the Schoolmen did not follow him in this. But could they by any process of elimination dispel the atmosphere of "this-worldliness" in which the Aristotelian philosophy is admittedly steeped? They themselves were the most unworldly of men. But did they adequately appreciate the danger of relying so confidently on a philosophy[1] and an ethic which had no horizon beyond this world? Was not the instinct of the ancient Fathers sounder, which led them to pass over Aristotle, in spite of his intellectual brilliance, in favour of Plato, who added to his greater literary charm a definite spiritual outlook from windows opening on to a future life?

We must stop here in this brief review of the new era in theology ushered in by the scholastic subservience to Aristotle, and revert to our own subject. The question arises, did the almost inspired authority ascribed to him affect S. Thomas, say, the greatest of the Schoolmen, in his presentation of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body?

Aristotle in denying individual immortality treated the body as a temporary thing. How far did this attitude of his react on his scholastic admirers? The reply would seem to be that it heightened the tendency, already roused by Albigensian perversity, to state the doctrine in the most uncompromising terms and to leave it at that, totally ignoring the moral dynamic of the doctrine.

S. Thomas devotes extraordinarily little space to the doctrine itself considering how largely it bulked in S. Augustine, for him the most authoritative of the Latin Fathers. He does, however, discuss very fully certain "circumstances

[1] S. Thomas quotes Aristotle not by name but by the proud title of "the Philosopher."

and concomitants" of the resurrection, which most moderns are content to leave undetermined,[1] ministering, as they do, to curiosity rather than to edification, and having little or no value for practical life.

It is vain to try to give a summary of S. Thomas' teaching in his own words, as he never uses a word superfluously. The whole passage must be read in full, if his teaching on the resurrection is to be grasped in all its details. We may feel that much of the detailed discussion could be spared, and that the decisions at which he arrives are often inconclusive from our lack of sufficient knowledge on such minute and abstruse matters, but he is never one to shirk a difficulty or to decline to give a reasoned opinion on any question put by his contemporaries. With Bible, Church tradition[2] and Aristotle in hand he goes gallantly forth to meet all and every challenge of the inquirer, even where we with our seven hundred years of added experience would cry a halt.

NOTE.—The subjects discussed may be gathered from the headings, *e.g.* :—

Question 75. *Of the Resurrection :* (*a*) Will there be a resurrection of bodies ? (*b*) Will the resurrection be universal ? (*c*) Is resurrection natural ?

Question 76. *Of the cause of the Resurrection :* (*a*) Is the Resurrection of Christ the cause of our resurrection ? (*b*) Is the sound of the trumpet a cause of our resurrection ? (*c*) Will the Angels be the agents of the resurrection ?

Question 77. *Of the time and mode of the Resurrection :* (*a*) Ought the time of the resurrection to be postponed until the end of the world ? (*b*) Is the time of the resurrection hidden ? (*c*) Will the resurrection be at night-time ? (*d*) Will the resurrection be all at once or in turns ?

Question 78. *Of the starting-point of the Resurrection :* (*a*) Will death be the starting-point in all cases ? (*b*) Will the resurrection of all be from ashes ? (*c*) Have the ashes from which the human body will be refashioned any natural tendency towards the soul which will be united to them ?

[1] See *Quæstiones*, 75–85, *Tert. Par. Sum. Theo. Suppl.*, Migne's Edition, vol. iv. pp. 1272–1346.

[2] In the course of his works, S. Thomas quotes from no less than fifty-two Fathers. S. Augustine among the Latins and S. John of Damascus among the Greeks seem to be his favourites.

Question 79. *Of the conditions affecting those that rise again, and first of their identity:* First to be considered are those things that are common to bad and good, (*a*) Will it be the same body (*i.e.* and not a different one)? (*b*) Is it the same identical man? (*c*) Must the same ashes return to the same parts where they formerly were?

Question 80. *Of the integrity of the bodies of those who rise again:* (*a*) Will all the members of the human bodies rise again? (*b*) Will the hair and nails? (*c*) Will the fluids? (*d*) Will the totality that was in them of the truth of human nature? (*e*) Will all that was in them materially?

Question 81. *Of the quality of those that rise again:* (*a*) Will all rise again of the same age? (*b*) Will all rise again of the same stature? (*c*) Of the same sex? (*d*) With the animal life?

It is obvious that many more such questions might be propounded by the curious.

Referring, therefore, the leisured reader to his unrivalled pages for a detailed discussion of topics concerning the resurrection, which the curious of his time had raised, we can only note briefly his teaching on the two essential features of Christian doctrine on the body's resurrection, the continued identity and the wondrous transmutation.

The first occupies by far the larger space, not only because it had always been the Western tendency to concentrate on this, but also because it had been freshly denied at the time by the Albigensian heresy which had spread like wildfire through the greater part of Christian Europe. He asserts or assumes the identity of the risen body in every line, and even seems to make it depend on a revival of the physical residue which remains after the dissolution of the earthly body.[1]

But the judicious reader will find not a little to mitigate the crudeness of this language. His real concern is to maintain that there is no possible doubt about the fact of the continuity. The enormous moral issues dependent on it can admit of no doubt on that head:—

It must be said that the necessity for claiming that there is a resurrection arises from the necessity that it should be possible for man to attain the ultimate purpose for which he was created.

[1] Vol. iv. *Quæst.* 78, 2 and 3, pp. 1286–1293.

Now this cannot happen in the life here, nor in the life of the soul separated from the body, as was said above, XXV. i. and ii. Otherwise man would have been made in vain, if he could not attain the end for which he was created.[1]

The impression that his conception of identity is not so "materialistic" as some of his language would imply, is strengthened if one reads carefully his elaborate discussion of the opinion that it is the persistency of the germ-plasm which preserves in this life the identity of the everchanging earthly body, and constitutes the link between it and the glorified body. This theory, which commends itself to many modern thinkers, he neither rejects altogether nor accepts altogether. After pointing out that the physical material of the body is not a constant thing but is always in a state of rejection and renewal, and that consequently if all the physical material, that had formed part of a man's body in a lifetime, were to be raised up again, the man would be a monster,[2] he sums up his conclusions :—

One must say that what is materially in a man has no affinity to resurrection, except in so far as it pertains to the truth of human nature, because in this respect it has an affinity to the rational soul. But all that is in a man materially pertains to the truth of human nature only (quidem) in so far as it belongs to the species ; but not all, if by all is meant all the matter, for all the matter that has been in a man from the beginning to the end of his life would exceed the quantity due to the species. . . . Therefore all that is in a man will rise again, if by all we mean the totality of the species (and species implies quantity, shape, situation and order of parts) ; but it will not all rise again, if by all we mean the totality of matter.[3]

That is, S. Thomas contends that the risen body will be a real human body, and not one belonging to some other species, and will have all that appertains to the truth of human nature.

But it must be frankly admitted that all these delicate distinctions could not be expected to be apprehended by

[1] *Ib. Quæst.* 79, 2, p. 1294.
[2] *Ib. Art.* V. 3, *sed contra.*
[3] *Ib. Quæst.* 80, 5, *Respondeo*, pp. 1304–5.

the ordinary unphilosophical man. He would be apt to rest on the cruder and less balanced statement.

With regard to the transmutation undergone at the resurrection, S. Thomas does not discuss it at much length, but he expressly states at the outset :—

> Holy Scripture foretells not only the resurrection; but equally the refashioning of our bodies (quoting Phil. iii. 21).[1]

He devotes four elaborate chapters[2] to a discussion of the impassibility, subtilty, splendour, and mobility of risen bodies, which totally differentiate them from the weak, gross, heavy, dull bodies in their former life. These inferences, which he draws mainly from 1 Cor. xv., fixed the notions of the mediæval world concerning glorified bodies. They will be found, expressed practically in S. Thomas' words, in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, quoted later on.[3]

We part reluctantly from this great mind, this great Christian, conscious of having done him scant justice, and with unfeigned sorrow for those unfortunate enough not to be able to appreciate one framed as he was on the heroic scale, the Christian Aristotle.[4]

[1] *Ib. Quæst.* 78, 2, p. 1289.
[2] *Ib.* pp. 1310–1337.
[3] Pp. 243–250.
[4] Cf. Dean Rashdall's high estimate of S. Thomas, *Universities of the Middle Ages*, vol. i. pp. 267–8.

CHAPTER XV

SCHOLASTICISM:

THIRD PERIOD, ENDING WITH THE REFORMATION

THE golden age of Scholasticism ended with the death of Duns Scotus in 1308. From that time until its final manifestation in the Reformers of the sixteenth century it steadily declined. The seeds of decay, which it had within it from the first, bore fruit in process of time. Argumentation for the sake of argument, the submission to rationalising debate of spiritual things which are spiritually discerned, the discussion of matters of faith in precisely the same way as mere indifferent matters of opinion, controversy over all sorts of trivial or hypothetical cases, hair-splitting distinctions, these and suchlike blemishes, which are not altogether wanting in S. Thomas and are conspicuous in Duns Scotus, tended more and more to discredit the method in the hands of smaller and less devout men. A man need not be a religious man at all to shine in bouts of scholastic disputation. Sharp wits were more required than living faith. True religion is not so to be served.[1] Religion engages the whole man—will, affections, conscience, spiritual intuitions, and not the brain only. Consequently as the scholastic method degenerated into a clever game of intellectual ingenuity, it became more and more divorced from reality and from the needs of practical life.

A William of Ockham and a Wycliffe could and did on occasion turn against vital points of faith the weapons that were forged for their defence, and lesser men were not

[1] Cf. S. Ambrose: "It pleased not God to make His people's salvation depend on argumentation." *De Fide*, i. 42, P. L. Tom. 16, col. 559.

slow to follow their lead. In fact, the Reformation is not remotely an aftermath of Scholasticism, and its dreary and interminable discussion of abstruse questions is in the old familiar style. It is only fair to say, however, that Scholasticism is not its sole begetter. The Renaissance with its revival of pagan ideals and pagan morals in high places, contributed its share; and not least, the horrible greed which the lavish expenditure of high ecclesiastics inspired, and which led them to make merchandise of the Church's most sacred treasures—her Eucharists, her gifts of Reconciliation, her prayers for her departed members.

With regard to the resurrection of the body there is not a word written that need detain us, from S. Thomas to the swarm of Confessions produced by the Reformation. Nor do these latter contribute a single fresh feature to the method of expressing the doctrine, nor throw a single ray of light on it. They simply repeat at its dullest the teachings of the Schoolmen. There would be no excuse for giving the time and space we are about to give to setting out the various Protestant definitions of the resurrection, were it not that it would be impossible to clear up modern difficulties on the subject without knowing the crude and unbalanced statements which are responsible for most of these same difficulties. We have already said that the Scholastics, from whom in direct succession the Protestant Confessions derive their method of expressing the doctrine, are themselves both crude and one-sided. They, however, always presupposed an acquaintance with the more balanced teaching of the Fathers. Above all they were saved from the worst effects of their partial treatment of the subject, by their familiarity in theory and practice with the only risen human Body that yet exists, viz. that which sits at the right hand of God, and yet is present sacramentally on ten thousand Altars, and is really and truly given to and received by myriads of communicants, the Bush that ever burns and is never consumed. Christ's Apostle declares that He will fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the Body of His Glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subject all things

to Himself (Phil. iii. 21). Those who were used first to adore and then to receive the glorified Body of the Lord knew that It had passed beyond our limitations of time and place and sense. All their language about the risen body was necessarily conditioned by this ineffable spiritual experience.

Alas! this double index to the interpretation of their language about the resurrection of the body was blurred or entirely lacking amongst the continental Reformers. It was their boast that they attached little or no importance to the patristic tradition, and even when as in the Lutheran Confessions there remained more or less clear echoes of Eucharistic teaching, they gradually lost the few Priests who had been commissioned to consecrate the Eucharist. So the formal teaching of their standards became a dead letter. The lack of these correctives left the definitions borrowed from the Schoolmen in all their naked crudeness.

We shall take in chronological order the chief Protestant Confessions, beginning with that of Augsburg, and extract [1] from them what they say regarding the resurrection.

Augsburg Confession, 1530.—The first great Protestant Confession of Faith was presented to the Emperor Charles V. by the Lutheran Princes assembled at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. The doctrinal matter of the document is attributed to Luther himself, though he was not present. He was represented by Melanchthon, who was responsible for its final shape and form. The only reference to the resurrection in the Augsburg Confession is in Article 17 of Part I.:—

> Christ shall appear at the last day to Judge, and shall raise up all the dead.[2]

Luther's smaller Catechism, issued in the previous year, contained the Apostles' Creed with the Article "the resurrection of the *flesh*."

The First Helvetic Confession, 1536.—The first Helvetic Confession is mainly the result of the efforts of Bucer and Bullinger to bring together the Lutherans and the Swiss

[1] The quotations are taken from Schaff's *Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches*.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 17.

followers of the more extreme Zwingli. It was formulated by a clerical and lay assembly, held at Basle, and was signed in February, 1536. It is much fuller in its teaching on the resurrection :—

He [*i.e.* Christ] Himself raised His own Flesh from death and placed it in heaven at the right hand of the Almighty, that it might be a full and perfect hope and pledge of our immortality.

When He has triumphed over death, sin, and hell, the Conqueror and Leader, who is also our Head and true Chief Priest sitting at the Father's right hand, constantly watches over and pleads our cause, whilst He fashions us anew after the image after which we had been created.

We look for His coming at the end of all the ages as the true and righteous Judge, and for His passing sentence upon all flesh, which shall first have been raised up for that judgment, and that He will carry the pious above the sky, and will condemn the impious, body and soul, to everlasting destruction.[1]

The French Confession of Faith, 1559.—Calvin was the chief agent in preparing the Confession of the Reformed Church of France, which was adopted in 1559, and whose Christology is still acknowledged, after a period of hesitation. As might be expected from such a scholar as Calvin, when not engaged on Predestinarian subtleties, the reference to our Lord's Resurrection is sound and balanced :—

We believe that in one Person, that is, Jesus Christ, the two Natures are actually and inseparably joined and united, and yet each remains in its proper character: so that in this union, the divine nature, retaining its attributes, remained uncreate, infinite and all-pervading; and the human nature remained finite, having its form, measure, and attributes; and although Jesus Christ in rising from the dead bestowed immortality on His Body, yet He did not take from it the truth of its nature; and we so consider Him in His Divinity that we do not despoil Him of His Humanity.[2]

There is in this Confession no further reference to man's resurrection, but the French Reformed Church uses the Apostles' Creed, as has been reaffirmed by their Synod of

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 216.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 368.

1872. The Synod, suppressed by State authority for two hundred and twelve years, resumed its sessions under the First Republic, and by a narrow majority asserted its orthodoxy on the question of our Lord's Divinity.

The Scottish Confession of Faith, 1560.—The first Scottish Confession was almost wholly the work of the stalwart John Knox. It was drawn up by him and a committee in four days at the request of the Scottish Parliament and adopted August 17, 1560. Article V. speaks of the First Advent in these terms :—

> Till the coming of Jesus Christ in the *flesh*.[1]

And in Article XVII. we have this description of the Intermediate State :—

> The Elect departed are in peace and do rest from their labour: not that they sleep and come to a certain oblivion, as some Phantastics do affirm.[2]

The following sentence occurs in Chapter XXV. :—

> . . . in the general Judgment there shall be given to every man and woman resurrection of the flesh: for the sea shall give up her dead; the earth they that therein be enclosed; yea, the Eternal our God shall stretch out His hand on the dust, and the dead shall rise incorruptible, and that in the selfsame flesh that every man now bears, to receive according to their works glory and punishment.[3] . . .

The Belgic Confession, 1561.—Next in date comes the Belgic Confession, which was drawn up in 1561, approved at various Synods, and revised at that of Dordrecht in 1619. It is the doctrinal standard of the Reformed Churches in Holland and Belgium, and of their offshoots in the U.S.A. and South Africa, though at present in Holland there are many who sit loose to it.

The XXXVIIth Article reads as follows :—

> Finally, we believe, according to the Word of God, when the

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 442.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 459.
[3] *Op. cit.* pp. 477–8. N.B.—Modern spelling is substituted for the old Scots.

time appointed by the Lord (which is unknown to all creatures) is come, and the number of the elect complete, that our Lord Jesus Christ will come from Heaven, corporally and visibly, as He ascended, with great glory and majesty, to declare Himself Judge of quick and dead, burning this old world with fire and flame to cleanse it. And then all men will personally appear before this great Judge, both men and women and children, that have been since the beginning of the world to the end thereof, being summoned by the voice of the Archangel and by the sound of the trumpet of God. For all the dead shall be raised up out of the earth, and their souls joined and united with their proper bodies in which they formerly lived. As for these who shall then be living, they shall not die as the others, but be changed in the twinkling of an eye from corruption into incorruption.[1]

The Heidelberg Catechism, drawn up in 1563, is used by the same Bodies as use the Belgic Confession. It has two questions bearing on the resurrection. It contains the Apostles' Creed. Question 49 asks :—

What benefit do we receive from Christ's Ascension into Heaven ?

First, that He is our advocate in the presence of His Father in heaven. Secondly, that we have (Him who is) our Flesh in heaven as a sure pledge that He as our Head will also take us His members up to Himself.[2]

Question 57 runs :—

What comfort does the resurrection of the flesh afford you ? That not only my soul, after this life, shall be immediately taken up to Christ the Head, but also that this my flesh, raised by the power of Christ, shall again be united with my soul and be made like unto the Glorious Body of Christ.[3]

The Second Helvetic Confession, 1562.—The Second Helvetic Confession, of all those set forth during the sixteenth century, is far and away the most consonant with the Christian tradition. It was composed by Bullinger as a declaration of his own faith in 1562, but speedily became public and was widely adopted. It is a lengthy theological

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 433-4.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 323.
[3] *Op. cit.* pp. 325-6.

treatise rather than a popular creed. It begins with a creed of Pope Damasus, of which this is the concluding paragraph :—

> And He [*i.e.* Christ] when He had overcome the Kingdom of Death, with that Flesh in which He was born, suffered, died, and rose again, ascended to His Father, and sitteth at His right hand in the glory which He always had and has. We believe that we have been cleansed in His Death and Blood, and that we are to be raised up by Him, in the last day, in this flesh, in which we now live.

After reciting this Creed the signatories of the Swiss Reformed Cantons in 1566 add the touching words :—

> Since then we are all of this faith and religion, we hope we are to be regarded by all men not as heretics, but as Catholics and Christians.[1]

Chapter XI. 11, speaks thus of our Lord's Resurrection :—

> We believe and teach that the same our Lord Jesus Christ in His own very flesh, in which He was crucified and died, rose again from the dead, and that He did not raise up flesh other than that which was buried, nor take to Him spirit instead of Flesh but retained the reality of His Body.

Sections 13 and 14 of the same chapter, dealing with the Judgment at the last day, have this declaration concerning the resurrection :—

> The dead shall rise, and those, who at that day (which is unknown to all creatures) shall be alive, shall be changed in the twinkling of an eye, and all the faithful will be caught up together to meet the Lord in the air, that thence they may enter with Him into the bodies of Blessedness to live endlessly. But the unbelieving or unrighteous will go down to hell with the devils to burn for ever and never to be delivered from torments.
>
> We condemn, therefore, all who deny a real resurrection of the flesh, or who, with John of Jerusalem, against whom Jerome wrote, do not think rightly about glorified bodies.[2]

XI. 18 : And that in a few words we may say many things

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 236.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 257.

pertaining to this matter, whatever has been defined concerning the mystery of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ from Holy Scripture, and is contained in the Creeds and decisions of the first four most eminent Councils, held at Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, together with the Creed of Saint Athanasius, and all these similar Creeds, we believe with sincere heart, and with a free mouth honestly profess, condemning everything that is contrary to them. And after this manner we hold inviolate or complete the Christian faith, Orthodox and Catholic: knowing that there is nothing contained in the aforementioned Creeds which is not agreeable to the word of God, and altogether makes for a sincere exposition of the Faith.[1]

Heresies are expressly condemned: the Manichæans, Valentinians, and Marcionites (I. 8, p. 238); Monarchians, Noetians, Patripassians, Sabellians, Macedonians, and Arians (III. 5, p. 241); Pelagians (VIII. 7, p. 248); Manichæans and Pelagians (IX. 12, p. 252); Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites and Monophysites (XI. 7, p. 255); Novatians old and new, and Cathari (Albigenses?) (XIV. 12, p. 265); Anabaptists (XXX. 4, p. 306); and many other less known heretics.

The Form of Concord, 1580.—The *Form of Concord* was an attempt to settle a number of bitter controversies, which raged amongst the Lutherans, and into which it is a relief not to have to enter. We are concerned only with the document's brief allusions to the resurrection of the body.

Article I. ii. speaks of "the resurrection of the flesh" as one of "the chief articles of our Faith," and contains this clause:—

> This same human nature of ours (which is His own work) Christ has redeemed, the same (since it is His work) He sanctifies, the same He doth raise from the dead, the same (as being His work) doth He crown with great glory.[2]

The Westminster Confession of Faith, 1647.—The Westminster Confession was drawn up by an Assembly of Divines, called together and nominated by the Long Parliament

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 258.
[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 98–9.

against the express orders of the King. The Confession was imposed by Parliament upon all Parishes in England and Wales on June 29, 1647, and the Book of Common Prayer proscribed; but the Presbyterian formula, though imposed by law until it was repealed at the Restoration, never got a real hold on England. Its spiritual birthplace and home was Scotland. There it became and still is the doctrinal standard of the established Kirk.

The Westminster Confession refers thus to our Lord's Resurrection :—

Chapter VIII. iv.: On the third day He rose again from the dead, with the same body in which He suffered: with which also He ascended into Heaven and there sitteth at the right hand of the Father.[1]

The general resurrection is dealt with in Chapter XXXII. i. ii. and iii. :—

i. The bodies of man after death return to dust and see corruption; but their souls (which neither die nor sleep) having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God, who gave them. The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens,[2] where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies: and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torment, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none.

ii. At the last day, such as are found alive shall not die, but be changed; and all the dead shall be raised up with the selfsame bodies and none other, although with different qualities, which shall be united with their souls for ever.

iii. The bodies of the unjust shall, by the power of Christ, be raised to dishonour; the bodies of the just, by His spirit, unto honour, and be made conformable to His own glorious Body.[3]

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 621.

[2] Note this entire elimination of Paradise (Luke xxiii. 43), which we learn from John xx. 17 was not the same as the heaven to which Christ ascended. The plight of the waiting souls of Rev. vi. 9–12 is ignored; as is also Matt. xxv. 34, where we learn that it is not until the Son of man shall come in His glory that the blessed shall be invited to inherit the Kingdom.

[3] *Op. cit.* pp. 670–1.

The Westminster Shorter Catechism was prepared by the same Assembly of Divines in 1647, and was adopted by the General Assembly of the established Kirk in Scotland the following year. Questions 37 and 38 relate to the resurrection :—

37. What benefits do believers receive from Christ at death? The souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in holiness and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection.

38. What benefits do believers receive from Christ at the resurrection?

At the resurrection believers being raised up in Glory shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted in the day of Judgment, and made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all Eternity.[1]

The Apostles' Creed at the end of the Shorter Catechism is as we say it at Matins or Evensong, *i.e.* it has "the resurrection of the body," not "of the flesh," as in the Baptismal Service.[2]

The *Savoy Declaration* was agreed upon in 1658, to set forth "the Faith and Order owned and practised in the Congregational Churches in England." In matters of faith it follows the Westminster Confession. But in 1833 a shorter declaration of principles was put forth by the Congregational Union of England and Wales. They guard themselves by declaring that they do not regard it as a creed or "as a standard to which assent should be required."[3] It contains a brief reference to the resurrection in Section XIX. :—

They believe that Christ will finally come to judge the whole human race according to their works; that the bodies of the dead will be raised again.[4] . . .

The *Baptist Confession* of 1688 is a modification of the Westminster Confession as regards the peculiar tenets of

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 684.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 703.
[3] *Op. cit.* p. 730.
[4] *Op. cit.* p. 730.

the Baptists. The paragraphs regarding the resurrection remain unchanged.[1]

The Easter Litany of the Moravians, 1749.—The *United Brethren* or Moravians published in 1749 an Easter devotion, part creed, part litany, from which are extracted the following declarations :—

> . . . yea, I shall attain the resurrection of the dead, for the body which I shall put off, this seed-corn of corruptibility, shall put on incorruption ; my flesh shall rest in hope. And the God of peace, that brought again our Lord Jesus that great Shepherd of the Sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, shall also quicken these our mortal bodies, if so be that the Spirit of God hath dwelt in them.[2]

The Methodist Articles of Religion, 1784.—In 1784 John Wesley prepared for his followers in the U.S.A. twenty-five Articles of Religion, a modification and abridgment of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. The third Article reads :—

> Christ did truly rise again from the dead and took again His Body with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven and there sitteth until He shall return to judge all man at the last day.[3]

Most Methodists, if not all, use the Apostles' Creed. The English Wesleyans in England and their missions include the Nicene Creed in their Communion Service, which, however, in practice is usually abridged by beginning at the Offertory sentences.

The Evangelical Free Church of Geneva, 1848.—The Free Church of Geneva seceded from the established Church and issued in 1848 a Confession of Faith, the XIIIth Article of which is interesting as a modern Protestant statement of belief regarding the resurrection :—

> We expect from heaven our Saviour Jesus Christ, who will

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 738. Cf. The New Hampshire Baptist Confession of 1833, Article XVIII., *ib.* p. 748 ; and the Confession of the Free-Will Baptists, 1868, Chapter XX. *ib.* p. 756.

[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 804–5.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 807. The doctrinal statement of the Evangelical Alliance of 1846 includes the resurrection of the body in its VIIIth Article, *ib.* p. 828.

change our body of humiliation and make it conform to His own Body of glory; and we believe that, in that day, the dead who are in Christ, coming out of their tombs at His voice, and the faithful then living on the earth, all transformed through His power, will be taken up together into the clouds to meet Him, and that thus we shall always be with our Saviour.[1]

The Free Church Catechism, 1898.—A Free Church Catechism prepared by a Committee on which the Congregationalists, Wesleyan Methodists, Baptists, Primitive Methodists, English Presbyterians, Methodist New Connexion, Bible Christians, and United Methodist Free Church were represented, issued a Catechism in 1898. To what extent it is used is doubtful. It has this singularity that it contains no reference whatever to the resurrection of the body. Its only mention of a future life at all occurs in the answer to Question 15 :—

15. 2. What does the resurrection of Jesus teach us?

A. It assures us that He has finished the work of our redemption; that the dominion of death is ended; and that because He lives, we shall live also.

The judgment, either general or particular, is not once mentioned, nor is everlasting life, nor punishment for unrepented sin.

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 784. Cf. VIIIth Article of the Creed of the *Free Christian Church of Italy*, *ib.* p. 788.

CHAPTER XVI

LATER TEACHING IN THE HISTORICAL CHURCHES

A. *The Church of England*

LOYALTY and affection dictate that the Church of England and the overseas Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury should occupy the first place in a treatise written by one of her sons. He believes that in spite of some confusions and hesitations, she has the promise of the future, and is destined of God to be the Church of the reconciliation, and to be a chief instrument in His hands for bringing about the visible Reunion of all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.

Her firm grasp of the three great historic Creeds, with their quite different verbal expression of the mystery of the resurrection, prepares her not to be terrified by differences of wording, when the soul of a doctrinal statement is sound. She can afford to look behind the words to the meaning. In the Apostles' Creed itself she gives utterance to her belief in the resurrection in its old original form: *Dost thou believe in the resurrection of the flesh?* This ancient baptismal form occurs in the Baptismal Service and in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. On the other hand, the Daily Offices have: "I believe in the resurrection of the *body*," an alternative wording constantly occurring in S. Augustine and the Western Fathers generally, but never admitted into the Creed, until the Church of England herself did so in the sixteenth century.[1]

[1] See p. 50. It is interesting to observe that English Roman Catholic Catechisms and Books of Devotion follow her in the popular use of "resurrection of the body," in the Apostles' Creed and generally.

"Body" instead of "flesh" first appeared in *The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man*, 1543; and was inserted in Matins and Evensong in 1552 for the first time in a public service. There is no record of any discussion over the change.

In her highest service of all, the Nicene Creed declares the same doctrine in a form, the most generally used of all: *I look for the resurrection of the dead*, common to all the historical fragments into which the one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church has unhappily been shattered.

The Athanasian Creed, again, expresses the doctrine quite differently: *He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies: and shall give account for their own works.*

This rich variety in stating the same doctrine saves from a mechanical and unintelligent recitation of the words, and stimulates inquiry into the meaning which they all alike are intended to express.

In addition to the Creeds, the Church of England has a statement of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body peculiar to herself. Article IV. of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion in direct words applies only to our Lord's Resurrection. But as His Rising again is not only the pledge and source of His people's resurrection, but supplies the model to which their bodies are to be conformed, the Article indirectly describes the manner of the general resurrection. The words, therefore, have a double importance. Here they are:—

> Christ did truly rise again from the dead and took again His Body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature, wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth until He return to judge all men at the last day.

The words "flesh, bones," obviously refer to S. Luke xxiv. 37–9. At our Lord's sudden appearance in the midst of them the Apostles *were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit* (*i.e.* a ghost). *And He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and wherefore do reasonings arise in your heart? See My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself: handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not* flesh and bones, *as ye behold Me having.* So whatever be the exact significance of *flesh* and *bones* in this passage the same words in Article IV. mean this—no more and no less; and whatever they mean when spoken of the risen Body of our

Lord, that is their meaning when used of the risen bodies of His members, since it is to His risen Body that ours are to be conformed (Phil. iii. 21). The Evangelist is at great pains in the whole passage to show that the Body of our Lord had undergone a profound transformation, which raised it above the physical conditions of ordinary life on earth.

S. Luke makes a great point of the effect on S. Peter's mind of the position of the grave cloths.[1] S. John (xx. 7) is still more explicit. The undisturbed wrappings testified that the Body was so changed that it disencumbered itself of them in a manner impossible to the ordinary human body,[2] alive or dead.

The Risen Christ joins the two disciples on the way to Emmaus and does not at first suffer Himself to be recognised by voice, manner, or appearance (Luke xxiv. 16), like as also Mary Magdalene did not recognise Him at first (John xx. 14). When He had instructed the two regarding His Resurrection He was made known to them in the breaking of the bread (Luke xxiv. 31, 35). As soon as they recognised Him, He vanished out of their sight (xxiv. 31).

The two disciples hurried back to Jerusalem, and recounted their amazing experiences to the Apostles. Whilst they were discussing these and the appearance to Peter, He Himself stood in the midst of them (xxiv. 36).

And finally, *He led them out until they were over against Bethany; and He lifted up His hands and blessed them. And it came to pass, while He blessed them, He parted from them and was carried up into heaven* (xxiv. 50–1).

These positive evidences, and the negative fact that He was no longer, as before His death, continuously in their company, but only on occasion, when and as He willed, impressed on the Apostles' minds how great a change had passed over His Humanity.

The reality of the risen Humanity is no less emphasised. They can recognise Him. He claims that it is "I Myself,"

[1] Some MSS., however, omit verse 12. See Dr. Plummer's note on the reading, S. Luke xxiv. 12, in *Internat. Crit. Com.*

[2] See on this point Latham, *The Risen Master*, pp. 32–90.

and invites them to assure themselves by the sense of touch as well as of sight and hearing. And to make surety doubly sure to them He eats the piece of broiled fish [1] in their presence.

We are here in a region outside the normal actions and limitations of human experience in this life. It would seem to have been one main purpose of our Lord's deferring His Ascension for forty days, that He might give His Apostles and through them the Church of all ages, as vivid an impression of what a spiritual body means as we can have until we know it in actual fact, when He shall quicken our mortal bodies, and assimilate them to His own glorified Body. And this not merely to stimulate our aspirations towards the splendid future, but to interpret for us our present privilege and duty of feeding on that life-giving and glorious Body.

This phrase, then, of Article IV., "with flesh and bones," directly derived from S. Luke, points to the identity of His transformed human Body.

It is the same Body. He assures them of its identity

[1] The patristic writers with one voice, and S. Thomas with them, are fain to insist on the absence of all need of eating and drinking in the life of the resurrection. What, then, mean the Marriage of the King's Son on the lips of our Lord (Matt. xxii. 2–14); and the Bridegroom's wedding feast to which the ten virgins are invited (Matt. xxv. 1–12)? What means "*until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's Kingdom*" (Matt. xxvi. 29, cf. Mark xiv. 25)? What the promise that the Lamb shall feed them (Rev. vii. 17)? The tree of life which bare twelve manner of fruits and yielded her fruit every month (Rev. xxii. 2)? And the Marriage Supper of the Lamb (Rev. xix. 9)?

Just this, that only under such imagery could be conveyed in our earthly tongue and to our earthbound imagination some conception of that heavenly bliss which corresponds to and yet outstrips immeasurably the most jubilant life we know of in this world. It calls up a picture of brilliance, gaiety, goodwill, good fellowship, where all are at their best and see others at their best, in free exchange of knowledge, experience, wit and fancy shimmering as harmless as summer lightning, all wants provided for without stint or grudging, no satiety, no fear for the future, no envy, no jealousy, each in his own fulness of joy rejoicing in the joy of others, each feeling he has all the Heart of the Host, as if there were none other.

We are not to think that because the real will transcend all the descriptions that therefore these modes of expression are negligible. Picture language, being more universally intelligible, is used to raise our expectations to a height which the event will far surpass.

Prof. A. E. Taylor has some trenchant remarks on this point in *The Faith and the War*, pp. 154–5. The late Father R. M. Benson's Meditations on S. Luke xxiv. 42, in *The Life Beyond the Grave*, are peculiarly instructive.

and reality by partaking [1] of food, not because the risen Body needed food, but to give the Apostles unmistakable evidence of the Body's reality.

It is essentially the same and yet it is not the same. It offers itself to be handled ; and it appears and disappears at will.

It is passing strange that some Christians are pained by the expression in the Article, and curiously enough it is just those who in controversy exalt Holy Scripture over the Church—that conspicuous example of a false antithesis—that are most inclined to recoil from this scriptural phrase.

The concluding part of the expression in Article IV. is an admirable definition of the continuity of the risen Body—" all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature."

There was strong contemporary (1553) cause for laying stress on the reality of the Resurrection Body. The prevalence of Anabaptist denials made it necessary.[2]

The weak sense of the Real Presence and infrequent Communion have at times obscured the truth of Article IV. amongst certain sections of English Churchmen. In our time this truth has suffered eclipse where men do not grasp the full significance of the Incarnation, or are inclined to Nestorianism. But signs are not wanting that this wave has spent its force.

If we take the book *Immortality*,[3] for example, with its distinguished essayists, any candid critic must admit a decided advance. The first essay stumbles over a " physical resurrection," [4] but then that is not a Christian expression at all. The very point of the resurrection of the body is that it is non-physical though real. S. Augustine, S. Leo, S. Gregory, and the whole line of Greek Fathers labour to distinguish between the Christian idea of the spiritual body and the resuscitation of the physical body, which

[1] Cf. Acts x. 41.

[2] Cf. The Lutheran *Formula of Concord*, 1576, Art. X. i. Schaff., p. 174. Cf. p. 177, on the Schwenkfeldians.

[3] *Immortality, an Essay in Discovery, co-ordinating Scientific, Psychical, and Biblical Research.* By B. H. Streeter and others, 1917.

[4] See p. 258.

some Hebrew speculators imagined.[1] The essayists protest against an imaginary Christian doctrine which Christian teachers of old repudiated and Christian teachers of to-day equally disclaim. Writers of such eminence should really be above setting up men of straw to have the satisfaction of knocking them down. The expressions "physical resurrection," and "bodily resurrection," used throughout the book in the same material[2] sense, occur constantly to denote the Christian tradition. The first is never used by any Latin or Greek Father. The second is used only as a convenient alternative for "resurrection of the body," and does not carry with it any gross or materialistic suggestion.

Canon Streeter's own essay is a really admirable contribution to the subject, especially in its first forty pages. It is only towards the end that he hesitates over the Scriptural teaching regarding the connection between this body and the body of the future, and rejects the waiting time and the last judgment. But even this is not done with dogmatic arrogance. These are welcome signs of closer approximation among "liberal theologians" to the traditional teaching of Scripture and the Church. The once too prevalent habit of discrediting plain Scripture truth because it is unpalatable is going out of fashion. As English Churchmen recover more intimately their inheritance of devotion to our Lord's Sacramental Presence in the Eucharist, and realise in communion His risen Body as the spiritual food of their souls, cavils about the resurrection of the body will die out completely. Faith will rest contentedly on the revelation of God's love towards His handiwork, humanity, body as well as soul; and will wait in confidence for the unveiling of His method in fact. We now believe it in mystery.[3]

[1] See p. 54.

[2] *I.e.* "material" in the popular, not the philosophic, sense.

[3] It would be very ungrateful not to mention the incalculable services rendered to the English Church by Westcott's writings on the Resurrection, especially his *Gospel of the Resurrection*, and *Revelation of the Risen Lord*. The eminent Presbyterian divine, W. Milligan, did admirable work in his *Resurrection of our Lord*, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*, and especially in *The Resurrection of the Dead*.

B. *The Eastern Orthodox Church*

Our view has latterly been confined to the Church in the West. It is time to turn our eyes to the East. Five considerable names link the age of Basil and the Gregories with authoritative Confessions now current in the Orthodox Church. These names are S. John of Damascus, Photius, Œcumenius, Theophylact, and Gennadius.

S. John of Damascus, born about 685, *died about* 760.—At the time of S. John's birth his native city of Damascus had been for a century and a half in Muhammadan hands. His father was a high official in the Caliph's court. The future saint and author was born in the last decade but one of the seventh century and was educated by Cosmas, a learned Italian monk, who had been taken captive in one of the Caliph's forays and brought for sale as a slave to Damascus. He was bought and set free by John's father, and made his clever son's tutor. When his education was completed, the young man entered the Caliph's service and eventually became his Vizier.

He came into notice as a promising writer in the Iconoclastic controversy. Leo the Isaurian, the Emperor at Constantinople, issued his Edicts (726–730) against the reverence paid in Christian churches to the sacred icons and pictures, confusing this instinctive respect with the worship which is due to God alone. Bitter controversy arose and threatened to tear the Church asunder. John took up his pen in defence of the established usage, and roused the bitter animosity of the imperial party, which did its best to embroil him with the Caliph. The latter naturally sided, on Muhammadan principles, with the Iconoclastic party. Eventually the Vizier was reconciled to his Master, who offered to take him into favour again; but John requested to be allowed to retire to a monastery. He chose the famous convent of S. Sabas near Jerusalem. The story of the noviciate of the brilliant young nobleman is one of the most famous of the Middle Ages. The monks were rather abashed at the prospect of having to train a man of such commanding position and intellect. A simple,

rough, but pious old monk at last undertook the task, and set the gently nurtured and accomplished novice to the most menial tasks about the convent. John passed these tests of his humility, and proved his vocation with such simplicity and alacrity that he was admitted to the community by general acclaim. He spent a happy quarter of a century there teaching, preaching—he was ordained Priest by the Patriarch of Jerusalem—and pouring forth theological, philosophical, mystical, and exegetical works, the extant remains of which fill three stout folio volumes in Migne's collection of the Greek Fathers. He is the first of the Fathers to use Aristotle, four hundred years before the Schoolmen in the West, but with greater balance and sanity. Knowing Greek thoroughly, he was not dependent on faulty versions as they were. He is one of the greatest of hymn writers, and the great bulk of hymns in the Eastern Church Offices are from his pen. Hymns 132 and 133 in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* are his, translated by J. M. Neale. The *English Hymnal* has these and two others, 138 and 360. The favourite hymn, " Those eternal bowers," is by him. An accomplished musician, he fulfilled for the Eastern Church much the same rôle as S. Gregory did in the West.

The most important passage in S. John Damascene's writings, dealing with the resurrection, occurs at the end of his treatise *On the Orthodox Faith* :—

When we speak of the resurrection we mean the resurrection of the body, for a resurrection is the raising up a second time of something that has fallen. Souls being immortal, how can they be raised up again ? For when men define death as a separation of the soul from body, resurrection is altogether a union again of the soul and body, a second raising up of a creature that suffered dissolution and fell. That same body, therefore, that is corrupted and dissolved, shall rise the same and incorruptible. For He, who in the beginning formed it from the dust of the earth, is not without power to raise it up again, after it has been dissolved and has returned, at its Maker's decree, to the earth from which it was taken.

For if there is no resurrection, let us eat and drink (Isa. xxii. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 32), let us pass our life in voluptuous enjoyment. If there is not a resurrection, in what do we differ from the

irrational creatures? If there is not a resurrection, let us felicitate the beasts of the field for their having a carefree life. If there is not a resurrection, there is no God, nor Providence, but all things are tossed about and carried hither and thither by pure chance. For behold, we see many righteous folk in want and ill-treated and receiving no recompense in this life, and sinful and unrighteous men flourishing in riches and luxury. What rightly minded person would think this proceeds from justice or wise foresight? There will, therefore, be a resurrection. So, if the soul engaged alone in the struggles of virtue, it would also be crowned alone, and if it was alone involved in those unlawful enjoyments, it would alone be justly punished; but since the soul pursued neither virtue nor vice without the body, justly shall both together receive the requital.

Holy Scripture[1] testifies that there shall be a resurrection of our bodies: Gen. ix. 5, 6; Exod. iii. 6; Matt. xxii. 32; Wisd. iii. 1; Ps. civ. 29, 30; Isa. xxvi. 19; Ezek. xxxviii. 7, 8; Dan. xii. 1–3; John v. 28–9; 1 Cor. xv. 16, 17, 20; Col. i. 18; 1 Thess. iv. 13; John ii. 19; Luke xxiv. 39; John xx. 12. Again the Holy Apostle says: *For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.* And again: *It is sown in corruption, it will rise in incorruption; it is sown in weakness, it will rise in power; it is sown in dishonour, it will rise in glory; it is sown a natural body, it will rise a spiritual body*, unchangeable, impassible, subtle (for this is what *spiritual* means, such as evidently was the Body of the Lord after His Resurrection; capable of entering though the doors were shut), unwearied, without need of food or sleep or drink. *For they shall*, says the Lord, *be as the angels of God; no longer is there marriage or child-bearing* (Mark xii. 25). *For our citizenship is in heaven, from whence also we wait for a Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the Body of His glory* (Phil. iii. 20–1); speaking not of a change into another sort of form[2]

[1] The passages which here follow are quoted in full and commented on.

[2] μορφή in the Aristotelian sense, meaning another species of being, *i.e.* it continues to be a human body though it be transformed; cf. Epiphanius, *Hær. c.* 64, T. G. Tom. 41, col. 1182: "Thou seest the natural body and the spiritual body are the same in identity. Just as our Lord did not raise up another body, but the selfsame Body that He had had, changing it into spiritual tenuity (εἰς λεπτότητα μεταβαλλὼν πνευματικήν), and by converting it into something altogether spiritual. He entered in though the doors were closed—a thing which cannot be done by our bodies in this life owing to their solidity and grossness, and to their not yet having attained that spiritual tenuity." See also *Ancoratus, c.* 91, P. G. Tom. 43, col. 183.

—God forbid—but of a transformation from corruption to incorruption.

But some one will say, How are the dead raised up? Oh! the unbelief. Oh! the folly. He who changed dust into a body, He who bade a tiny drop of germ-plasm to grow in the womb and to form this diverse and multiplex instrument of the body, will much more raise it up again by His mere wish, after it has been in existence and has suffered dissolution. "With what kind of a body do they come?" Foolish man, if your obtuseness is such that you cannot trust God's words, at least believe His acts. *That which thou thyself sowest is not quickened except it die; and what thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare seed-corn—it may chance of wheat or some other grain. But God gives it a body as He willed, and to each of the seeds its own body* (1 Cor. xv. 35–38). Contemplate the seeds buried in the furrows, as it were in tombs. Who is it that supplies them with roots, stalk, leaves, and beard and most delicate ears? Is it not the Creator of the Universe? Is it not the behest of Him who made everything? In like manner, believe it, shall the resurrection of the dead be by the Divine will and order. For He has power which keeps pace with His will.

So we shall rise, our souls uniting once more with our bodies when the latter become immortal and put off corruption; and we shall stand before the dread Judgment seat of Christ; and the Devil and his evil spirits, and the wicked and sinful, and that Man of his, *i.e.* Antichrist, shall be given over to the everlasting fire, not material fire, such as we have here, but of a kind which God knows. But they that have done good shall together with the Angels shine like the sun in life eternal with our Lord Jesus Christ, seeing Him ever and being seen, and reaping His Joy that never ends, and praising Him with the Father and the Holy Spirit to infinite ages of ages. Amen.[1]

Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople 857–886.—It is not easy to get an unprejudiced account of the remarkable man who occupied the Patriarchal throne at Constantinople when the great Schism between East and West was started. The Schism was not consummated until the time of the Patriarch Michael Cerularius (1043–58). In fact, intercommunion was restored in the time of the Patriarch Anthony II. (893–5) for a century and half, but there had been

[1] *De Fid. Ortho.* iv. 27, P. G. Tom. 94, pp. 1219–28.

ever-increasing estrangement from the time of Photius. Latin writers are inclined to make the most of any elements of weakness in the position of Photius, though they admit that his private life was unblemished both as layman and cleric, and they do not deny his learning or his orthodoxy.

Born at Constantinople about 815, of a family connected with the Imperial Court, he was marked out for high office by his conspicuous ability and love of learning. As quite a young man he became chief Secretary of State. But the crisis in his fortunes came when the young Emperor—Michael the Drunkard—deposed the Patriarch Ignatius for refusing communion to his uncle Bardas who had married his own step-daughter. Photius was appointed to the post, and his ordination and consecration were rushed through in six days against all the canons. It was a fatal step, and involved him in trouble all his days, besides giving a handle to his enemies.

The Emperor wrote to the Pope, Nicholas I., to get him to approve of the deposition of Ignatius and the appointment of Photius. The two Legates sent by the Pope to inquire into matters agreed to the Emperor's action, but the Pope refused to support his Legates and insisted on the restoration of Ignatius and eventually excommunicated Photius. This was the beginning of the Schism (862). Four years later Photius returned the compliment and excommunicated the Pope, but in the same year his Patron the Emperor Michael was murdered, and all the latter's friends, including Photius, were expelled from their posts. Ignatius was restored and held the Patriarchate for ten years until his death. Thereupon Photius succeeded to the vacant see. The Pope—then John VIII.—withdrew the excommunication and acknowledged him, but he had cause to rue this, for Photius, at a great Synod in S. Sophia in 879, to which he had invited Legates from the Pope, repeated his accusations against the Latins, and anathematised all who added to the Nicene Creed.[1]

[1] This refers to the *Filioque* clause, which is the main theological reason dwelt on in this unhappy controversy. The others are all disciplinary, or matters of ceremonial. The real dividing line is the question of jurisdiction and supremacy, though it is seldom mentioned explicitly.

John excommunicated Photius afresh, and so the Schism broke out again.

In 886 Photius suffered the very same fate as had befallen Ignatius. He was deposed from his see by another young Emperor, Leo VI., who wanted the position for his younger brother Stephen. Rome, to its credit, refused to acknowledge Stephen, and it was only in his successor Anthony's time that reunion between East and West was restored. Photius lived in retirement for another ten or eleven years.

It is a tangled and unedifying tale. An impartial critic would probably agree that all the faults were not on one side. But to this day Photius is venerated as a saint in the Eastern Church, and is, on the contrary, roughly handled by Latin writers, who lay all the blame for the beginning of the Schism at his door.

Photius is only introduced here because of his eminence as a writer, and because he marks the open parting of the ways between East and West, which had been threatening ever since the foundation of New Rome—the proud title of Constantinople. The jealousy between the Old and the New was always tending towards a breach.

His contribution to the subject before us is comparatively slight and only incidental. In a long epistle addressed to Michael, the first Christian ruler of Bulgaria, on the duties of a Prince, he begins with a recital of the Creed and a brief history of the great General Councils. Speaking of the Fifth General Council, he mentions its condemnation of some erroneous opinions of Origen and others. Among these opinions was a denial of the resurrection of the body [1] :—

> Moreover they would have it that bodies do not rise along with their souls. They are for raising the souls naked without their bodies, entirely mistaking the meaning of "resurrection," for resurrection is the raising up of something fallen and dead, not of that which stands always and abides in incorruptibility, such as is the soul. Nor are those wretched men ashamed of

[1] This charge must have been directed against the others, for Origen, as we have seen, pp. 94–99, was strong on the subject. Photius seems only to have read the fourth book of Origen's *de Principiis*; see *Bibliotheca*, xxii. P. G. Tom. 103, p. 59, and to have got his knowledge, not from Origen's works, but at secondhand; see *ib.* xxi., cxvii. and cxviii.

the great injustice of which in their folly they accuse the Just Judge. For how can they escape the charge of alleging extreme injustice in His action, when they wickedly say that the bodies that have shared with the souls in the toils of virtue are deprived of a share in the rewards that are common to both; or on the other hand, when they leave the bodies that shared in sin entirely unpunished for the mutual blame and ill-doing, and declare that He exacts the double penalty from or bestows the double recompense upon the souls alone, apart from the bodies which joined in the deeds throughout? [1]

Œcumenius, Bishop of Tricca in Thessaly, end of Tenth Century.—Very little is known of the personal history of Œcumenius, who was Bishop of Tricca in Thessaly in the closing years of the tenth century. His valuable Commentary on the New Testament has come down to us, omitting the four Gospels. It is largely compiled from the most noted Greek writers and sometimes gives extracts from important books no longer extant.

He touches on the resurrection of the body in several passages. Perhaps the following will give a fair idea of his view and his mode of expressing the great truth. Commenting on 1 Cor. xv. 44, *There is an animal* (natural) *body and there is a spiritual body,* he writes:—

That no one may say, "Whence come those different bodies that you introduce and call 'animal' and 'spiritual'?" there is, says he, an animal body and there is a spiritual body. So the Apostle declares—it is not on my own authority or out of my own imagination that I say this, for it was said long before our time. "Whence can this be shown?" some one says. Thus is it written, *The first man Adam became a living soul* (Gen. ii. 7), *i.e.* a body with a soul. Then, *the Last Man became a lifegiving spirit, i.e.* a spiritual body, which is in harmony with the lifegiving Spirit. "And how is this shown? viz. that the Second Man became a lifegiving spirit? How comes that?" From the very force of the facts. Moreover, this, too, is written, *The words,* saith He, *which I speak to you, they are spirit and life* (John vi. 63), *i.e.* to quicken unto spirit those that hear and obey them; and since this is so, it is evident that they will have a spiritual body at the resurrection, a body that can no

[1] *Ep.* I. viii. 15 B, P. G. Tom. 102, p. 645.

more be turned into an animal body, as sometimes comes to pass in this present life.

"*The first man Adam became a living soul.*" And do not doubt, saith he, that our bodies which are animal (natural) shall then be spiritual. For we already have illustrations of this. For Adam had an animal body, but Christ had a spiritual body, which enjoyed the full presence of the Holy Spirit. The dove abiding upon Him shows that. In so far as the Lord is and is understood to be Man, He had within Him the working of the Paraclete; although that Spirit was His very own Spirit, in so far as He is, and is understood to be, God. And observe that the Spirit is *lifegiving*. When the proper sequence would require the word "*living*" spirit, as he said animal body, instead he uses the expression "*lifegiving*" spirit.

The body is called spiritual, not that attenuated and air-like body, which some say souls will take to them at the resurrection—one of those who say this is Origen—but the body is called spiritual, as possessing the full energy of full participation in the Holy Spirit: just as a vessel is termed a wine or oil jar from what it contains.[1] In like manner he called the body "animal" because it is indwelt by soul (*anima*=ψυχή) and not by Spirit.

Another explanation: He called the body spiritual, because it will no longer be subject to the burdens of corruption, and because it has been fully decked out with incorruption and glory. The same flesh, therefore, rises again with the same form,[2] no longer having a disposition at the mercy of the passions, but subject to the Spirit, since it shall have been transformed into a more glorious and loftier condition, according to the saying—"the humiliation of corruption having been swallowed up by the brilliance of incorruption."[3]

Theophylact, Archbishop of Bulgaria 1078–1110, *about.*—Bulgaria had accepted the Christian faith some time in the ninth century. It had been a bone of contention between Old and New Rome, which should have the oversight of its Bishops. Constantinople prevailed because its claims were backed up by the Emperors. But towards the end of the

[1] This explanation is taken from Methodius, *De Resurr.* xiii. P. G. Tom. 18, col. 283. Evidently Œcumenius is not quite satisfied with it, for he goes on to give another interpretation.

[2] Form, *i.e.* the philosophical term, almost="identity"; that which causes a thing to be recognisable as what it is.

[3] *Comm. in Ep.* 1 Cor., P. G. Tom. 119, pp. 885–7.

eleventh century, the Bulgarian Archbishop claimed to be autocephalous, that is, independent of both Patriarchs. It is notorious that in our own times one great cause of the bitterness between Greeks and Bulgarians is the assertion of this very claim of independence. The subjects of the Patriarchs of Constantinople consider the Bulgarian Church schismatic because the claim has been revived in the days of Bulgaria's pride and prosperity. As long as Bulgaria formed a part of the Turkish Empire, the Patriarch of Constantinople had been acknowledged as having authority over the Bulgarian Church.

But in the time of Theophylact, who comes next in our chain of witnesses, the claim of the Bulgarian Church to independence was made, though less aggressively. Theophylact, himself a Constantinopolitan, had been tutor to Constantine the Heir Apparent, and rather hankered after a return to more civilised surroundings from the wild and semi-barbarous country of which he was the spiritual chief. He kept up a lively and friendly correspondence with the authorities both of Church and State in Constantinople.

Exact dates are not known, but the last decade of the eleventh and the first of the twelfth centuries saw him as Archbishop of Bulgaria. He was an accomplished scholar and possessed a singularly clear, straightforward style. His Commentary on the New Testament is quoted with respect by modern scholars. It is shrewd, pithy, and to the point. He makes great use of Chrysostom, but presents him in plain prose instead of the glowing rhetoric of the great orator.

Theophylact's commentary on the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians is an excellent example of his method, but we only have room for a few brief notes. On verse 3 he speaks of the resurrection as "being the foundation of the whole Faith." [1] The reason given for applying the expression "fallen asleep" to the dead in verse 6 is that "falling asleep" implies waking up presently.[2] Verse 35,

[1] P. G. Tom. 124, p. 754.
[2] *Ib.* p. 756.

How are the dead raised? And with what manner of body do they come? gives rise to this short exposition :—

There are two questions; the method of the resurrection: *How* is the body that has been dissolved raised again? And *with what manner of body* does the resurrection take place—with this present body or some other body? He solves both questions by the illustration of the seed-corn. He solves them (ver. 36) by something familiar, that they did daily. Hence he calls men foolish for being ignorant of things so manifest. Thou who sowest things thyself, though thou art thyself corruptible, how canst thou doubt about God? "*It is not quickened except it die.*" Here he uses words appropriate to bodies rather than to seeds. For he saith not, "It does not germinate except it be dissolved," but "*It is not quickened except it die.*" Notice how he turns the question round to the very opposite: to them it appeared a difficulty, How shall we be raised up after death? But he asserts the very opposite: We shall be raised for this very reason that we do die; for otherwise it is impossible to be made alive again, if death had not taken place.

And that which thou thyself sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other kind (ver. 37). He had said there were two difficulties: *How* are the dead raised, and *with what manner of body?* He solved the first: resurrection comes by way of death, as in the case of the seed-corn.

So proceeding to explain the sort of body with which they shall be raised up, he solves the second difficulty. The same body, saith he, rises, or at least it is of the same substance (or essence), but more resplendent and more beautiful.

But the heretics say it is not the same body that is raised up and the Apostle shows this, they assert, for he says: "*Not the body that shall be!*" But this is not what the Apostle says. What does he say, then? Thou sowest it not such as it shall be, glorious, in sooth, and beautiful, but just a bare grain, yet the ear springs up in all its beauty; neither is the ear altogether the same (*i.e.* as the bare grain), for it was not an ear that was sown, with its stalk and beard in very truth, but a bare grain; nor is it altogether different, for the stalk comes not from another grain, but from that bare grain aforesaid.[1]

Would it be possible to state the doctrine of the

[1] P. G. Tom. 124, p. 772.

resurrection of the body in fewer and simpler words? The identity is qualified by the transformation in a way that is exceptionally clear and intelligible. One more example of Theophylact's sound common sense. 1 Cor. xv. 38 reads, *God giveth it a body, and to each of the seeds its own body.* He comments :—

> Beyond gainsaying, this stops the mouths of the heretics who assert that the same body shall not be raised up at the resurrection but another one. For, lo! you hear, its own proper body is given to each.[1]

Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople 1453–1457.—Of the more than fifty stout folio tomes which occupy Migne's edition of the Greek Church writers from Photius to Bessarion, only Œcumenius and Theophylact deal at any length directly with the resurrection. This is to be regretted in the case of so notable an author as Gennadius, who was at the Council of Florence in 1438–9 in attendance on his Master the Emperor John VIII., and made most conciliatory speeches with a view to healing the schism between East and West. This desirable result would have been effected if the ostensible causes of division had been the real cause. The real point at issue had been glozed over in the friendly atmosphere of the Council, viz. the Papal claim to supremacy. When the deputation returned to Constantinople this was realised, and the patched-up reunion went at once to pieces. About fourteen years after the abortive Council Constantinople was taken by the Turks. The see had been vacant three years, when Gennadius was induced to accept the thankless and dangerous post—the first Patriarch under the Turkish conqueror. He only held it for a few years, during the time of reconstruction, and then retired to a monastery in 1456 or 1459—the date is uncertain. He died in 1468.

It would have been particularly advantageous to have had a record of the contemporary teaching with regard to the resurrection from his skilful pen, but his two *Homilies on the Sacramental Body of our Lord Jesus Christ* [2] leave us

[1] P. G. Tom. 124, p. 773.

[2] *Ib.* 160, pp. 351–79.

in no doubt as to his upholding the unbroken Eastern teaching on the subject. The nearest approach to a considered statement is in his *Confession of Faith*, prepared for presentation to the Sultan. The twelfth Article runs thus :—

We believe that men's souls are immortal, that the bodies of the saints will rise again incorruptible, translucent (φωτεινά) and buoyant (ἐλαφρά), not needing food or drink or clothing, nor any other bodily pleasure; and that the souls and bodies of those who live righteously will go into Paradise, but those of the impenitent who are wicked and unbelieving will depart into punishment. The paradise of the saints and their beatitude is in heaven, but the punishment of the wicked is on earth (ἐν γῇ). And the beatitude of the saints means nothing else but that such souls shall become perfect in knowledge (εἰς τὴν γνῶσιν, *i.e.* in progressive knowledge). Then, too, they shall behold the mysteries of God, which now they know not, except through faith in Jesus Christ (διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).[1]

There are three comparatively modern expositions of the Faith in general use throughout the Eastern Orthodox Church, from which we extract the portions referring to the resurrection of the body.

1. Peter Mogilas, Metropolitan of Kieff, the father of Russian theology, issued in 1643 *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East.* It is by way of question and answer, but it is much longer and fuller than Western Catechisms.

What does the eleventh Article of the Creed teach (*i.e.* "I look for the resurrection of the dead")? It teaches the undoubted resurrection of men's bodies, both of the good and the bad, after death (ὅποῦ μέλλει νὰ γένη μὲ τὸν θάνατον), S. John v. 28. But the bodies will be the same as those in which they lived in this world, Job xix. 25. But this body, which we have said will be the same, will then be incorruptible and immortal at its resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 51–3. Besides it is proper that we should be certain (Ἀκόμι καὶ τοῦτο πρέπει νὰ ἠξεύρωμεν) that every soul will return to its own body.[2] . . .

2. The Synod of Bethlehem, held in 1672, under the presidency of Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, approved

[1] P. G. Tom. 160, p. 345.
[2] Schaff, *The Creed of the Greek and Latin Churches*, p. 396.

the Confession of Peter Mogilas, but added nothing of its own on the subject of the body's resurrection.[1]

3. *The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church*, approved by the Holy Governing Synod of Russia in 1839, is the instruction most used in the Græco-Russian Church, and is said practically to have superseded the earlier Confession of Peter Mogilas. On the eleventh Article of the Creed the teaching is full and clear. Here are the main questions and answers :—

What is the *resurrection of the dead*, which in the words of the Creed *we look for?*

An act of the almighty power of God, by which the bodies of all the dead, being reunited to their souls, shall return to life, and shall henceforth be spiritual and immortal, 1 Cor. xv. 44, 53.

How shall the body rise again after it has rotted and perished in the ground?

Since God formed the body from the ground originally, He can equally restore it after it has perished in the ground. The Apostle Paul illustrates this by the analogy of a grain of seed, which rots in the earth, but from which there springs up afterwards a plant, or tree, 1 Cor. xv. 36.

Shall all, strictly speaking, rise again?

All without exception that have died; but they who at the time of the general resurrection will be still alive will have their present gross bodies changed in a moment, so as to become spiritual and immortal, 1 Cor. xv. 51–2.

Why may we not ascribe to the souls of the righteous perfect happiness immediately after death?

Because it is ordained that the perfect retribution according to works shall be received after the resurrection of the body and God's last judgment,[2] 2 Cor. v. 10.

* * * * * *

Will the body share also in the happiness of the soul?

Yes; it too will be glorified with the light of God, as Christ's Body was at His Transfiguration on Mount Tabor, 1 Cor. xv. 49.

Will all be equally happy?

No, there will be different degrees of happiness in proportion as every one shall have endured the fight of faith, love, and good works,[3] 1 Cor. xv. 41–2.

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 401–44. [2] *Ib.* pp. 502–4. [3] *Ib.* p. 505.

C. *The Roman Catholic Church*

There has been comparatively little discussion of this Article of the Creed by Roman Catholic theologians in modern times. S. Thomas Aquinas is used as a text-book—and an admirable one, too—in the training colleges of the clergy, and he is more than ever authoritative since the Encyclical *Æterni Patris* of Leo XIII. However, some important statements of Christian doctrine have been issued which naturally touch on this subject. The chief of these is the so-called Catechism of the Council of Trent.[1] The Council of Trent in its twenty-fourth Session decreed that a Manual for Catechists should be prepared, and it required all Bishops to have it translated into the vernacular and expounded by all Parish Priests.[2] The work was committed to the foremost theologians of the day and with infinite care was completed in 1564, but not published until 1566. It had the full authority of Paul V. It is one of the best and most complete compendiums of the Christian Religion that has ever seen the light, and might be used word for word by the Eastern Church and by ourselves, with the exception of certain controversial points, into which there is no need to enter here.

The eleventh Article of the Creed occupies chapter 12, and is treated under fifteen heads.[3]

1. The importance of this Article is inferred from the fact that it is not only revealed in Holy Scripture, but reasons are given for it. S. Paul *e.g.* argues thus: *If there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised: and if Christ hath not been raised then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain* (1 Cor. xv. 13, 14). Therefore in explaining it the Parish Priest must at least take as great pains as many have impiously done in trying to overthrow it.

2. Men's rising again is called "the resurrection of *the flesh*, because the Apostles wished to lay stress on the soul's immortality;

[1] It is not a Catechism to be learnt by children, but a book of instruction for the parochial clergy in the work of Catechising.

[2] Con. Trid. Sess. XXIV. *de reform. c.* vii.

[3] The precise words of the original are given between quotation marks. For brevity's sake some portions are summarised.

and lest any one should think that the soul perishes along with the body. It is true that often in the Holy Scripture *the flesh* stands for complete humanity, *e.g. All flesh is grass* (Isa. xl. 6); and *The Word was made Flesh* (John i. 14). But in this place the word *flesh* signifies the body, that we may understand that of the two parts, body and soul, of which man consists, one only, *i.e.* the body, sinks into corruption, and returns to the dust of the earth, out of which it was formed, but that the soul remains incorrupt." [1]

3. Mention of *the flesh* is made also to refute the heresy of Hymenæus and Philetus (2 Tim. ii. 17), who in the Apostle's lifetime asserted that when the Holy Scriptures speak of resurrection, the resurrection of the spirit (*i.e.* in turning from sin to a life of righteousness) is meant and not the resurrection of the body. The words of the creed make it plain that such an error must be given up, and the true resurrection of the body be established.

4. The Parish Priest should illustrate this truth from both Old and New Testaments: 1 Kings xvii. 17–24; 2 Kings iv. 18–35; Matt. ix. 25; John xi. 43–4; Acts ix. 40; xx. 10; Job xix. 26; Dan. xii. 2; Matt. xxii. 31; John v. 25, 28, 29; 1 Cor. xv.; 1 Thess. iv. 13.

5. "But although by faith this is a truth most certain; yet it is profitable to show by analogies and reasonings that what faith proposes for our belief is not at variance with nature nor with the human mind's understanding."

So the Apostle offers the illustration of the seed and the plant springing from it (1 Cor. xv. 36). And S. Gregory compares the resurrection of the body to day succeeding night, to the growth of spring after winter (*Moral.* xiv. 28, 29, 30), etc.

6. "Arguments adduced by Church writers seem fitted to attest the doctrine, *e.g.*:—

"(*a*) Since souls are immortal and have, as part of man, a natural tendency towards human bodies, it must be considered contrary to nature that they should remain for ever separated from bodies. But as that which is contrary to nature and a violence to it cannot continue long, it seems reasonable that they

[1] This argument is quite sound as far as it goes, but, with all respect, may not the Scripture usage of *the flesh* as meaning the whole man hold good in the Creed? We should then be confessing our belief in the resurrection of the complete human being, *i.e.* that the soul, admittedly immortal, is reunited with its body at the resurrection, and that both then are said to arise. This does not seem to cast any doubt on the soul's immortality. See p. 50, and Appendices A, B, and C.

should be united again to their bodies; from which it follows that there will be a resurrection. Our Saviour Himself made use of this kind of argument, when in His disputation with the Sadducees He deduced the resurrection of the body from the immortality of the soul (Matt. xxii. 23).

"(*b*) Furthermore as the all-just God holds out punishments for the wicked and rewards for the good, and as very many of the former depart this life before they suffer due punishment, and of the latter without meeting any reward for their virtues; it necessarily follows that the souls should be reunited with the bodies to the end that as partners of their crimes, or the companions of their virtues they may become sharers in their punishments or rewards. This point is most elaborately treated by S. Chrysostom in his Homilies to the people of Antioch (*Hom.* 59 and 60). And so the Apostle, speaking of the resurrection says: *If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable* (1 Cor. xv. 19). No one can suppose that these words are meant to refer to misery of the soul. Since it is immortal, it could enjoy happiness in the future life, whether bodies were to rise or not. The words are to be understood of the man as a whole; for unless the body receives a due reward of its labours, those who, like the Apostles, endured so many afflictions and calamities in this life, would necessarily be the most miserable of men. The same doctrine is more explicitly taught in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians in these words: *We ourselves glory in you in the Churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and in the afflictions which ye endure; which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God; to the end that ye may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer; if so be that it is a righteous thing with God to recompense affliction to them that afflict you, and to you that are afflicted rest with us at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of His power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God and to them that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus* (2 Thess. i. 4–8)."

"(*c*) Add to this that so long as the soul is separated from the body, men cannot attain the perfect consummation of their felicity, replete with every good. For as a part separated from the whole is imperfect, so the soul which is not joined to the body must also be imperfect. Hence, it follows that, in order that nothing may be wanting to the consummation of its happiness, the resurrection of the body is necessary."

"By these, therefore, and similar arguments the Parish

Priest will be able to instruct the faithful in this Article."

7. "It will be needful also to explain, who are to be raised to life. Writing to the Corinthians, S. Paul says: *As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive* (1 Cor. xv. 22). Good and bad, then, without any distinction, shall all rise from the dead, although the condition of all shall not be the same: *They that have done good* shall rise *unto the resurrection of life: but they that have done evil unto the resurrection of Judgment* (John v. 29)."

8. "When we say *all*, we mean those who shall die at the day of Judgment as well as those who shall have died beforehand.[1] So S. Jerome (*Ep.* 152); S. Augustine (*de Civ. Dei.* xx. 20); 1 Thess. iv. 15–16; S. Ambrose (*in* 1 Thess. *c.* 4)."

9. "But since it is of much importance to be fully convinced that this very identical body, which belongs to each one during life, shall be restored to life, though it shall have been corrupted and dissolved into dust, this is a subject which demands accurate exposition by the Parish Priest. It is a truth conveyed by the Apostle when he says: *This corruptible must put on incorruption* (1 Cor. xv. 53), evidently by the word *this* designating his own body. It is also most clearly prophesied by Job (xix. 26–7). The same inference is drawn from the meaning of the word *resurrection:* for resurrection, as John Damascene defines it, is *a return to the condition from which one has fallen* (*de fid. Ortho.* iv. 28). Finally if we consider the reasons for a future resurrection already pointed out, every doubt that can possibly occur on the subject must come to an end. Moreover we have been taught that our bodies are to rise again, in order that *every one may receive the proper things of his body, according as he has done, whether it be good or evil* (2 Cor. v. 10). Man must rise, therefore, out of that very body, whose works served God or the devil, that together with the same body he may attain crowns of triumph and rewards, or most miserably endure penalties and punishments."

10. "Not only will the body really rise again, but all that appertains to its nature[2] and to the symmetry and comeliness of man is to be restored." So S. Augustine, *de Civit. Dei*, xxii. 10, 20, 21, and *Enchir.* 85, 87, 88, 89.

[1] The Vulgate and most of the uncial Greek MSS. of 1 Cor. xv. 51 read: *We shall all die* (or sleep) *but we shall not all be changed.*

[2] Compare the phrase of Article IV. of the xxxix.: "all things appertaining to man's nature."

11. "In the first place all the members that appertain to the truth of man's nature are at the same time to be restored. For they who were blind from their very birth, or who lost their sight from some disease, the lame, the maimed, or those who were paralysed in any of their members, shall rise again with their body complete and perfect, for otherwise the longing of the soul, which leans so to union with its body, could by no means be satisfied; and yet we believe that in the resurrection its desires will be fully realised. Besides, it is well established that the resurrection equally with the creation is to be numbered amongst the principal works of God. Therefore as at the beginning of creation all His works came perfect from God's hand, we should affirm that it shall also be so at the resurrection."

12. "Nor is it of the Martyrs only that this must be professed." S. Augustine testifies of them (*de Civit. Dei*, xxii. 20). "If these things be carefully considered by Parish Priests, a supply of words and ideas will never be lacking to stir up the hearts of the faithful and to enkindle in them a zeal for piety, that, thinking over the troubles and miseries of this life they may eagerly look forward to the blessed glory of the resurrection, which is laid up for the just and pious."

13. "It follows now that, if we look to what constitutes the substance (or *essence*) of the body, the faithful should understand, that although that selfsame body which had died must be restored to life again, its condition is yet to be other and different.

For to pass over all other points, all the bodies of those that rise again will differ from their former selves in this most particularly, that though formerly subject to the laws of death, they will, after their restoration to life, attain to immortality, good and bad alike."

14. For this wonderful restoration brought about by Christ's victory over death, see Isa. xxv. 8; Hos. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 26; Rev. xxi. 4; Heb. ii. 14, 15.

15. "Moreover the risen bodies of the saints shall possess certain transcendent and glorious distinctions, by which they will be ennobled far beyond what they ever were before. There are four special endowments, that are termed *gifts*, inferred by the Fathers from the doctrine of the Apostle." See on these, Augustine's Sermon 99, and Ambrose on 1 Cor. xv.

(*a*) *Impassibility.*

"The first of these is impassibility, *i.e.* a gift and endowment which shall place them beyond the reach of suffering anything

disagreeable, or being afflicted with pain or inconvenience of any kind. For neither severity of cold nor intensity of heat, nor the mighty rush of waters can harm them. *It is sown*, says the Apostle, *in corruption; it is raised in incorruption* (1 Cor. xv. 42). The reason why the Schoolmen called this quality impassibility rather than incorruption was to distinguish it as a property of a *glorified* body. For impassibility is not shared by the bodies of the lost. For the bodies of the latter, though incorruptible, shall be capable of experiencing heat and cold, and of being afflicted by various sufferings."

(*b*) *Splendour.*

"The next quality is splendour, by which the bodies of the saints shall shine as the sun, for so our Saviour testifies in S. Matthew: *The righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father* (Matt. xiii. 43). And that no one should entertain doubt on the subject, He exemplified it in His Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 2). The Apostle sometimes calls this *glory*, sometimes *splendour* (Phil. iii. 21). And again: *It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory* (1 Cor. xv. 43). The people of Israel in the desert saw a certain similitude of this glory, when Moses' face, after he had been in the presence of and had conversed with God, shone with such brilliance that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold it (Exod. xxxiv. 29 and 2 Cor. iii. 7). Now this splendour is a certain effulgence from the soul's supreme felicity overflowing on to the body, so that it is a certain sharing in that felicity: just as the soul itself is rendered blessed, because a portion of the Divine Felicity is transferred to it. But it is to be believed that all do not share equally in this gift, as they do in the first. For all the bodies of the saints will be alike impassible, but they will not have the same splendour: for as, the Apostle bears witness, *there is one splendour of the sun, another splendour of the moon, and another splendour of the stars: for star differs from star in splendour* (1 Cor. xv. 41). So also is the resurrection of the dead."

(*c*) *Mobility.*

"To this gift is added another (which they call *agilitas* [1]) by which the body will be freed from that heaviness, which now

[1] There is no exact equivalent in modern English for the Latin *agilitas*. "Agility" was used for it in the fifteenth century and onwards, but it is a word that has degenerated and now connotes "capering" rather than fleetness of movement.

presses it down, and shall be able to move with the utmost ease to whatever part the soul should wish, in such a way that there can be nothing swifter than that motion, as S. Augustine (*de Civit. Dei*, xiii. 18 and 20, and xxii. 11), and Jerome have taught (*Hieron. in Isa.* xl.)."

(*d*) *Subtilty.*

"To this is added another quality which they call subtilty, in virtue of which the body will be altogether subject to the sway of the soul, and will serve her and be on the instant at her behest. This is shown from the Apostle's words: *It is sown*, saith he, *a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body* [1] (1 Cor. xv. 44).

These are nearly all the principal heads which should be dealt with in explaining this Article."

16. "But that the faithful may know what benefits they are to gather from the knowledge of so many and such great mysteries, it will be necessary to declare (*a*) first that we should render boundless thanks to Almighty God because He *hath hidden these things from the wise, and hath revealed them unto babes* (Matt. xi. 25). For how many men, pre-eminent in praise for their wisdom and learning, have been utterly blind regarding this truth, certain though it be! That, then, He has made known to us things to the understanding of which we dared not ourselves aspire, is cause why we should celebrate His Supreme goodness and mercy with unceasing praise."

"(*b*) Then, too, this further great benefit will accrue from meditation on this Article, viz. that we shall easily be able to comfort ourselves and others when the death occurs of those who are bound to us by ties of nature or of friendship: a species of consolation we know the Apostle himself employed when he wrote to the Thessalonians *concerning those that are asleep*" (1 Thess. iv. 13).

"(*c*) But in all other afflictions and calamities the thought of the future resurrection will bring us the utmost alleviation of our sorrow, as we have learnt from the example of holy Job, who supported his afflicted and sorrowing mind solely with the

[1] Other exponents of *subtilitas* include that power whereby the risen body will be able to pass through "material" obstacles without hindrance and without disturbing them, as light passes through glass. Our Lord stood in the midst—though the doors were shut: cf. the definition of *subtilty* of the Catechism of Pius X., quoted p. 253. The first part of this note was written before a copy of the Catechism came to hand from U.S.A.

hope of one day rising from the grave and beholding the Lord his God" (xix. 26).

"(*d*) It must, besides, prove a most powerful influence with the faithful, that they should strive most earnestly to lead a life of rectitude and integrity, unsullied by any defilement of sin. For if they bethink them that those mighty treasures which follow on the resurrection are set before them as rewards, they would readily be attracted towards the pursuit of virtue and piety."

"(*e*) On the other hand, nothing will have greater effect in checking the inclinations of the mind, and withholding men from wrongdoing, if they are frequently warned of the evils and sufferings, with which the reprobate will be visited who at the last day will come forth to the resurrection of judgment"[1] (John v. 29)."

Since this constructive effort, not much has been done. Migne's *Theologiæ Cursus Completus*, Tom. 6, col. 345–56, does little more than transcribe the Tridentine instructions with some slight enlargement. Wilhelm and Scannell's *Manual of Catholic Theology*, vol. ii., devotes six pages to a jejune summary of the foregoing. On the question of the identity of the resurrection body, it ends up with this lame and impotent conclusion :—

The great difficulty against the resurrection of the body is as to how its identity is to be preserved. That we shall all rise again with the *same* bodies is of the very essence of the doctrine.[2] Nevertheless, the particles of the body are continually passing away and being replaced by others : and the particles of one human body may enter into the composition of other human bodies. We must not therefore press too far the material[3] identity of the earthly and the risen body. Some theologians, following S. Augustine, have thought it sufficient if any of the particles which at any time formed part of the earthly body are preserved. Others have not required even so much as this. We cannot here enter into the discussion. See Jungman, *De*

[1] *Cat. Conc. Trident.* i., *Art.* XI. pp. 128–41. Paris Edition, 1830. Quotation marks show translation in full. A few paragraphs are summarised.

[2] Here follow a few familiar quotations.

[3] Notice the expression "*material* identity," an unscriptural and unpatristic phrase.

Novissimis, c. iii. a. 2; Atzberger, *Die Christliche Eschatologie*, p. 916.[1]

One of the thinnest articles in *The Catholic Encyclopædia* is that on Resurrection. Two and a half pages are all that is given to the Resurrection of our Lord, the Keystone of the arch of Christian Faith; and one and a half to the General Resurrection. The appearances of our Lord after His Resurrection are spoken of as "apparitions," with that singular insensitiveness to the *nuances* of current English that disfigures so many English Roman Catholic books on religion. A perfunctory summary of the Tridentine Catechism and little else have to do duty as an exposition of the General Resurrection. The concluding sentence—on the risen body's "subtilty"—is, however, worth quoting:—

> The body participates in the soul's more perfect and spiritual life to such an extent that it becomes itself like a spirit. We see this quality exemplified in the fact that Christ passed through material objects.[2]

We reach scholarship of a different type in the last of the theological authorities, which will be referred to as illustrative of modern Roman Catholic teaching on the resurrection. Mangenot's *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, begun in 1903 and interrupted by the war, promises to be a real addition to the Theology of the Christian Religion, if it maintains the high standard set by the published volumes. It will be some time yet, at the present rate of production, before the article "Resurrection" is reached, but already we have a foretaste of its quality from that on "Glorified Bodies."[3]

It is altogether the most penetrating study of the subject that has appeared in recent times. It is so packed full of matter that no extracts can give a just estimate of its weight and value, and should be read in full by all who can consult its pages in any of our great libraries. Within the

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. ii. pp. 540–1. It is regretted that Jungman and Atzerger have not been accessible.

[2] *Cath. Encycl.* vol. xii. p. 793.

[3] *Dict. Théo. Cath.* tom. 3, 2, pp. 1879–1906, *Corps Glorieux*.

compass of twenty-seven folio pages it reviews the teaching of the Old and New Testaments, of the Fathers and of the Scholastics, in the most illuminating fashion, and deals fairly and squarely with modern objections to the body's resurrection. French lucidity and French acumen could do no more in the space.

Leaving theological works which are meant more or less for the student, we add from authorised Catechisms some present Roman Catholic methods of presenting the doctrine to children and simple folk.

The Westminster Catechism for England and Wales contents itself with this single question and answer :—

> What do you mean by "The resurrection of the body"?
> By "the resurrection of the body" I mean that we shall all rise again with the same bodies at the day of Judgment.[1]

The Maynooth Catechism for all Ireland goes into more detail :—

> What means the resurrection of the body?
> The resurrection of the body means, that we shall all rise again on the last day with the same bodies which we had in this life.
> Will our bodies rise united to our souls?
> Our bodies will rise united to our souls, in order to share in the soul's eternal bliss or misery.
> How are the bodies of the saints to rise?
> The bodies of the saints are to rise glorious and immortal (1 Cor. xv. 42–5).
> And where will the just go on the last day?
> The just will enter, with glorious and immortal bodies, into everlasting[2] life.

The Catechism of Pius X. for the Roman Province, translated by Bishop Byrne, contains these questions and answers :—

> *What does the Eleventh Article, the resurrection of the body, teach us?*
> The Eleventh Article of the Creed teaches us that all men

[1] P. 23. [2] Pp. 60–1.

will rise again, and that every soul will take again the body which it had in this life.

How will the resurrection of the dead be brought about?

The resurrection of the dead will be brought about by the Omnipotent God, to whom nothing is impossible.

Why does God wish the resurrection of the body?

God wishes the resurrection of the body, in order that the soul, having done good or evil when united with the body, may now together with it receive reward or punishment.

Will all rise in the same way?

No; there will be a vast difference between the bodies of the elect and the bodies of the damned, because only the bodies of the elect, after the likeness of Jesus Christ, when He arose, will have the endowments of glorious bodies.

What are the endowments that will adorn the bodies of the elect?

The endowments that will adorn the bodies of the elect are: 1st, *Impassibility*, by which they will no longer be subject to evil or pain of any kind, neither will they have need of food or rest or any other bodily want; 2nd, *Brightness*, by which they will shine as the sun and as so many stars; 3rd, *Agility*, by which they can pass in a moment without fatigue from one place to another and from earth to Heaven; 4th, *Subtilty*, by which without hindrance they can penetrate any body, as Jesus Christ did after His Resurrection.

And what will be the condition of the bodies of the damned?

The bodies of the damned will be destitute of all the endowments of the glorious bodies of the Blessed, and will bear upon them the appalling mark of reprobation. (*The Larger Catechism*, prescribed by his Holiness Pope Pius X. for all the dioceses of the Province of Rome, pp. 62–3.)

CHAPTER XVII

THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE THROWS LIGHT ON THE RESURRECTION BODY

SEVERAL references have been made incidentally to the connection between a right apprehension of the doctrine of the resurrection and the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist.[1] There is still room for some remarks on this neglected aspect of the matter.

It is a commonplace that Christian doctrine is so closely interlinked in all its parts that injury to one part affects the whole. This applies especially to all the fundamental truths of the Creed, as can be seen very clearly by the way that disbelief in the general resurrection reacts on the basis of the Christian Faith—that is, on the Resurrection of our Lord Himself, His Ascension, and His Coming again to judge the quick and the dead. These foundation truths, which are wrought into the very texture of the New Testament and have been preached by the Church from the beginning, are either denied outright by the impugners of the body's resurrection, or are so explained away that they cease to be a reflection of scripture or of the unquestioned belief of the Christian Church from the beginning. Some basic truths that are not expressed in the Creed, because of its primary purpose, are equally fundamental with those that were held necessary for admission to Baptism. They, and among them the Real Presence, were taught more fully after Baptism. Only the baptised were admitted to the full service of the Eucharist. Consequently there is no reference to the doctrine of the Eucharist in the baptismal

[1] See pp. 213–4.

Creed. But the Eucharist was from the first the bond of union of the Christian brotherhood. The celebration of that service of Praise and Thanksgiving, culminating in the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, is beyond dispute the mark of Christians, *i.e.* of all the baptised. No other Service of Christian obligation is mentioned in the New Testament, nor in the early centuries.

There is one uniform feature of that Service which has persisted through the ages, and is as clearly expressed in the Gospels and by S. Paul, by Justin and Ignatius, as by the English Church Catechism, the Council of Trent, and the Synod of Bethlehem. That which is given, taken, and received is the Body and Blood of Christ. That is the one unvarying testimony of all Christian writings of the early centuries. There have been at times differences amongst Christians about many other things, and differences, too, with regard to the philosophical explanations offered by theologians of the mystery of that Presence, and of the relation of the inner reality of the Sacrament to the outward signs. The differences relate to the "how" of the fact, not to the fact itself. Those who deprecate attempts to define the manner of the Real Presence do not mean to question the truth of our Lord's words: *This is My Body.* That is a truth of faith verified continuously by succeeding generations of worshippers and communicants. After consecration it is by the power of the Holy Ghost no longer mere bread: it has become the Body of the Lord.

All kinds of curious questions can be and have been raised concerning the glorious fact—most of them frivolous and unprofitable. What benefit could arise from discussing purely hypothetical questions, such as: "What would have happened if the Apostles had consecrated the Eucharist between our Lord's Death and His Resurrection?" [1] over which the Schoolmen used to chop logic and express opinions. "What are we to think happens if by accident an animal should swallow the Sacrament?" [2] and so on. It never

[1] Cf. Albertus Magnus, *On the Sentences*, IV. 12, 14, vol. xxix. p. 319.
[2] Innocent III., *De Sac. Alt. Myst.*, P. L. Tom. 217, col. 863. But cf. Peter Lombard, *Sent.* IV. 13, 1, *ad fin.*, P. L. Tom. 192, col. 868. "Deus novit hoc."

seems to have occurred to the highly ingenious disputants to suppress such curiosity with a simple—I do not know. It was such casuistic trifling that did much to bring the immemorial belief of the Church into disrepute. God alone can justly assess the blame. It is better for a man to put his hand on his mouth, and to cry mercy in his heart.

But in spite of this indulgence in curiosity and of attempts to simplify the mystery by accommodating it to the fashionable philosophy of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the great truth itself, built on the firm rock of the words of the Word made Flesh, believed in, tested and verified in the life experience of myriads of Christians, is held as firmly to-day by more millions of every grade of life, of intellect and culture than ever before in the history of the world. Many of those whose forefathers forfeited that inestimable boon—the pitiful Redeemer have mercy—are feeling after a recovery of their lost inheritance.

It is that truth, then, which should be placed in relation with the other truth of faith, *I believe in the resurrection of the flesh*, that the one mystery may, after the manner of Christian mysteries, shed light on the other.

In Christian language a mystery [1] is something that we can understand and reason about up to a certain point. *We know in part and we prophesy in part* (1 Cor. xiii. 9). But beyond that point it outstrips the argumentative reason, and reaches out into regions which transcend but do not contradict that highest of God's natural gifts. There faith reigns with a reason and a logic all her own, just because faith is a movement of the whole man, not of the intellect only, supreme though that be in its own department. Faith engages the affections, the conscience, and the will as well as the reason. Hence faith is neither made nor

[1] The word "mystery" occurs twenty-eight times in the New Testament, once as used by our Lord (Matt. xiii. 11; Matt. iv. 11; Luke viii. 10), four times in the Apocalypse, and the remainder in S. Paul.

It is an undue restriction of its meaning to confine it to the feature emphasised by S. Paul in Rom. xvi. 25, Eph. iii. 9, and Col. i. 26, viz. a secret now revealed. Even these revealed secrets run up into the strictly mysterious, though this feature is not emphasised in these passages.

Greek theology has an immense advantage in being able to use this New Testament word for the Sacraments. Tertullian's word "sacrament" has its drawbacks.

unmade by reasoning alone. It is that broad-based faith, the response of the whole spiritual being to God's approach, which apprehends the Christian mysteries. This is not to cast the slightest slur on reason. It is necessary, however, to point out its limitations, if we are to understand how it comes that God hides His mysteries from the wise and prudent and reveals them unto babes (Matt. xi. 25). It is a matter of common experience to find devout but simple unlettered folk rejoicing in an apprehension of the Christian mysteries which sophisticated but less devout people may justly envy (1 Cor. i. 19, 27; ii. 8). God is no respecter of persons. The riches of spiritual experience are open to the simplest, and are not denied to the wisest on earth, and at the same time spiritual poverty may be found in the intellectually great and little alike. Evidently there is something required beyond intellectual ability—or the absence of it—to account for faith or lack of faith. What that is in any individual case is known to God only.

The mysteries of the Christian faith hang together and are mutually explanatory. This fact holds good in a special degree of that Article of the Creed which deals with man's risen body in the future, and of the Article which proclaims the Resurrection of a human Body in the past, and of the sacramental distribution of that Risen Body in the present. The close connection between the future resurrection and the past is frequently dwelt on. The bearing of the present reception of that Risen Body on the future resurrection is set forth plainly in Scripture: *Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day* (John vi. 54); and no less plainly from the very first in Christian writers. S. Ignatius speaks of the "medicine of immortality."[1] But it is not so familiar to men whose impoverished spiritual experience knows little or, alas! perhaps nothing of the living power of the sacramental Body.

That is pointed out in passing. What we are particularly

[1] See *Ad Eph.* x. 13 and cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Quis div. salv.* 23; Irenæus, iv. 18, 5, v. 2, 3; and Sarapion's Sacramentary, *ποίησον πάντας τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας φάρμακον ζωῆς λαβεῖν* (*Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-book*, p. 63, Wordsworth's ed.).

concerned with here is the help given to understanding, as far as is possible whilst we are still on earth, what is meant by the resurrection of the body.

The forty days' interval between our Lord's Resurrection and His final withdrawal into the unseen seems to have had this end [1] in view, amongst others, to familiarise His Apostles with the nature of a risen human body, not by verbal description but by experience. Our human language is inadequate to express fully and our human minds too limited to take in ideas of things in a state of existence totally different from our present life. The most careful language is not without risk of grave misunderstanding. It would be impossible to explain to an unborn child what life in this world is like. Our Lord let His Apostles learn by experience how His Body, identically the same as that which hung upon the Cross, yet had become so transformed and spiritualised that it could appear and disappear as He chose. By this means He weaned them away from gross and "materialistic" [2] conceptions, and made the eating of His Flesh and drinking of His Blood no longer sound grotesque and repulsive. Instead it dawned upon them as the highest spiritual experience of which man is capable.

The quite shocking way in which some doubters and mistakers think to discredit the Christian Creed by talking of its teaching "a physical" [3] resurrection of our Lord show that they have not begun to realise the difference between the earthly Body of the Lord and His Risen Body, as shown in the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament,

[1] Cf. R. M. Benson, *The Life beyond the Grave*, Preface and *passim*.

[2] "Materialistic" is here used in its popular, not its scientific, sense. Light is "material," electricity is "material" in the strict sense.

Sir Oliver Lodge foresees a time "when scientific knowledge shall have so far advanced that no longer will the idea of a spiritual body seem vague and indefinite and difficult of apprehension" (*Hibbert Journal*, vol. xvii. p. 259)

[3] Cf. *Hibbert Journal*, vol. xvii. p. 230. Dr. Bethune-Baker, too, uses language which the Church has never used. Cf. "when we think neither of the Resurrection nor of the Ascension as 'bodily' occurrences in any natural or physical sense of the word 'bodily.'" (*The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, p. 133.) Just so. But then why attribute to the Church terms unknown in her formularies or accredited writers? The Church has not either thought or spoken of the Resurrection or of the Ascension as "bodily" occurrences in any physical sense of the word "bodily."

and most surely believed and taught by the Church all down the Ages. The plainest evidence of her belief is not so much the carefully chosen words of her Creeds and general teaching—for words can be misconstrued and misunderstood—but her assured and constant offer of that Risen Body as the spiritual food of her children's souls Such words as " physical " are entirely out of place as applied to that which is beyond and above the senses and is recognised and adored in faith. They are equally inapplicable to the bodies which shall be reunited to the soul at the resurrection. Dr. Bethune-Baker states the belief of the Church about our Lord's Resurrection in words, that as far as they go, could scarcely be bettered :—

> . . . the belief in the Resurrection of Jesus stands for the conviction that it was the whole Man, the whole personality, all that had gone to make Him what He was in this life, that survived the Crucifixion and Burial, or " rose " or " was raised " again. . . . It is this conviction that constitutes the faith of a Christian in the Resurrection. . . . He was still living in His perfected Manhood, able to guide and help them. Without this belief there can be no doctrine of the Incarnation, no Gospel, no Church.[1]

With the possible exception that the word " personality " is used loosely,[2] these words only need to be put in relation with the New Testament teaching about " eating the Flesh " of that perfected Manhood, to be a satisfactory expression of the common Christian Faith.

The vital inter-relation between all fundamental truths of the Christian Religion differentiates these truths from theological theories or opinions or deductions, about which men may and do differ without inflicting a mortal wound on the Faith.

No one, not even the simplest, can entertain physical

[1] *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, p. 132. It is to be regretted that the two preceding pages speak about " the resuscitation to life of the Body that died," " the re-animation of the Body," evidently meaning a restoration to the old life with its limitations, as Lazarus, or Jairus' daughter, or the widow's son was raised. See p. 176, for S. Augustine's express distinction between the two modes of resurrection.

[2] If it were regarded strictly it is, of course, pure Nestorianism.

ideas about the future resurrection of the dead, nor of the Resurrection of our Lord to which men's future resurrection is to conform, who is accustomed to approach the Altar in awe and reverence and love to feed on the Risen Body of his Lord, actually and really present there for him to receive.

S. Thomas, in those superb Eucharistic hymns of his which state the constant faith of Christians with admirable clearness and with complete freedom from speculative colouring, emphasises the fact that it is to faith, not to sense, that our Lord offers Himself in the Holy Eucharist as our soul's stay and refreshment.

Word-made-Flesh true bread He maketh
By His Word His Flesh to be;
Wine His Blood; which whoso taketh
Must from carnal thoughts be free,
Faith alone, though sight forsaketh,
Shows true hearts the mystery.

Therefore we before Him bending
This great Sacrament revere;
Types and shadows have their ending,
For the newer rite is here;
Faith, our outward sense befriending,
Makes our inward vision clear.

Thus does the mystery of the sacramental Presence of the Risen Body illuminate the mystery of the resurrection, when He "*shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the Body of His glory*" (Phil. iii. 21).

"*Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that if He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is*" (1 John iii. 2).

CHAPTER XVIII

MORAL DYNAMIC OF THE DOCTRINE

OUR inquiry has conducted us from the dim beginnings of human reverence towards the bodies of their dead through the instinctive feeling after a full resurrection in some of the myths; through the gradual disclosures in the Old Testament and the later light of devout Hebrew seers, to the full revelation of the truth in the teaching of our Lord, illustrated by His own Resurrection in complete Manhood. We have followed the march of that truth from the New Testament to the present day, noting the modes which the expression of it assumed in the mouths of Christian teachers and preachers of many races, of many types, of many varieties of culture. In them all one unvarying note is sounded. The future body of ineffable glory and beauty will preserve its continuity with the present body. Some have speculated, and perhaps speculated unduly, as to how the continuity is to be preserved, others have left it to be declared by the event, but all with one consent proclaim it.

It remains now to point out why this truth occupies so prominent a place in Christian preaching.

It is because of its profound practical importance in the individual and social life of men and women.

No fundamental Christian truth is of merely speculative interest. The mystery of the Blessed Trinity is the most moving and practical of truths. It forms the basis of all human social life. God has revealed Himself as Society in Unity, the model, the inspiration of that human social unity, towards which we are stretching out longing hands, in national and international life. Indeed the acid test of a fundamental article of Christian faith as distinguished

from more or less probable opinions is this—does the apprehension of it vitally affect human life ?

The calculation of logarithms or a problem in the binary quartics interests mathematicians ; the Newtonian theory of gravitation or Einstein's subversive contentions arouse men of science to keen discussion, but the facts are what they are independently of human theories about them. Neither these facts themselves nor the theories about them touch moral or spiritual life. It requires something more than an algebraic formula or a scientific theory to do that. It must at once be something simpler and more easily understood ; something that can be understanded of the child no less than the sage, of the man at the plough-tail as well as the man who directs a nation's destinies. The simplest can understand the claim to their allegiance of a truth which tells them that reverence and care for their own bodies and the bodies of others are due, because those bodies, though physically perishable, are the seeds from which spring the spritual bodies that are to be theirs to all eternity, and that the future glory will be bright or dim in proportion as they " keep their bodies in temperance, soberness, and chastity." What a powerful driving force we have here, at once persuasive and compelling, towards whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report in men's personal lives !

So, all that makes for the body's self-control shall have due honour. Wholesome sport, physical exercise, bodily training get a new meaning—" bodily exercise " [1] (1 Tim. iv. 8), regarded from the sportsman's point of view, may merely be " for a little time," but in the light of the body's resurrection it is seen to subserve eternal issues. The body demands its share in our religious exercises. We kneel reverently in prayer, we are temperate in food and drink and sleep, we fast at proper times.

[1] Dr. Bernard, *Cambridge Greek Testament*, Pastoral Epistles, p. 69, will allow no reference here to Greek games. It requires strong conviction to adhere to the traditional interpretation in the face of such a weighty opinion. E. F Brown in *Westminster Comm.* adheres to the more usual view, that S. Paul compares true bodily asceticism to the bodily training necessary for success in the games : *Past. Epp.* p. 36.

Everything that has to do with birth and life and death is seen to be sacred, as is all that ministers to health. Medicine, physicians, nurses deal with things honourable; research which tracks out the causes and cures of bodily ills is a high and holy calling.

The man who believes intelligently in the resurrection of the body cannot rest content with slum dwellings for the people; nor with hours of labour so exhausting that there is no time nor thought for a man's higher life of mind and soul. A medically unfit people is an offence against high heaven, as well as an indictment against any industrial system that breeds it or suffers it. Reasonable leisure and the knowledge to turn it to good account are demanded by this Christian doctrine.

Compare the prophetic vision of earthly prosperity :—

> The streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof (Zech. viii. 5);
> Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, both young men and old men together (Jer. xxxi. 13);

with this grim vision of adversity :—

> The new wine mourneth, the vine languisheth, all the merry-hearted do sigh. The mirth of tabrets ceaseth, the noise of them that rejoice endeth, the joy of the harp ceaseth. They shall not drink wine with a song . . . all joy is darkened, the mirth of the land is gone (Isa. xxiv. 7-11).

Too surely is the latter picture realised where the dignity of the human body is forgotten, and men think it right to exploit other men's bodies as a cheap mechanism to pile up profits withal; and the exploited, too besotted to uphold the sanctity of God's handiwork, sink into depths of degradation undreamt of by the prophets of Israel.

No man has a right to treat his brother's body as a convenience, and far less his sister's.

A heavy toll awaits any forgetfulness of God's truth. God by raising His Incarnate Son not in spirit only but in Body also, in complete Humanity, has made known the

glorious future for which the human body is destined. Alas for the man who profanes his body or the bodies of others! Unless he repents in dust and ashes, it were better for that man if he had never been born.

And what if even repentance and God's merciful forgiveness cannot altogether undo the past? We know they do not wipe out all earthly consequences. They can give peace of mind and strength and courage to do better for the future. But all disabilities do not disappear. Is that why the "celestial bodies" spoken of by S. Paul shine with varying effulgence? He likens them to the heavenly bodies of our earthly firmament :—

There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory (1 Cor. xv. 41).

Not all teachers and preachers of the everlasting Gospel have realised in their own minds or lives the full force of the truths, which as ministers and stewards of the mysteries they dutifully proclaimed. But at no time has the mind of the Church been unaware of the moral and spiritual dynamic of the resurrection of the body. Her least inspired and most commonplace spokesmen have always had that at the back of their minds when they laid stress on this, the distinctive doctrine of the Christian Religion.

The survival of the soul after death, a doctrine common to all religions,[1] is taken for granted as common ground. The immortality of the soul is not once put forward by itself in the Bible. The reason for this is very simple and very obvious. God had provided some better thing for us. Not a ghost survival, but a reconstitution of the complete being was what He had in store for us, to be made known in due time. He made it known by giving us an example of it in the Resurrection of His Son Jesus Christ.

That was the message committed to the Church. That

[1] With the possible exception of Buddhism and other forms of Pantheism, which regard the individual soul as being absorbed into the world-soul.

With regard to the Sadducean attitude, it is probable that they declined to advance beyond the primitive conception of a survival of the soul in Sheol or Hades. Their disbelief in a *resurrection* is quite compatible with this elementary standpoint.

and none other was the preaching of the Apostles. Beyond any possibility of question that was for S. Paul the characteristic doctrine of the Gospel. No shadowy immortality of the soul, but the resurrection of the body reunited to the soul :—

Now if Christ is preached that He hath been raised from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead ? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised : and if Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God ; because we witnessed of God that He raised up Christ ; whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, neither hath Christ been raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep have perished. If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most pitiable.

BUT NOW HATH CHRIST BEEN RAISED FROM THE DEAD, THE FIRST-FRUITS OF THEM THAT ARE ASLEEP.

It requires no small effrontery for men to give themselves out as Christian teachers, who would substitute for this robust faith a mere revival of the old philosophic belief, and maintain only that our Lord's soul continued to exist after death, just as the souls of others were believed to do, and that God did nothing special on the third day.[1] Of course, the Apostles, and S. Paul among them, may have been deceived or been deliberate deceivers. But then why bother about their teaching concerning a Palestinian visionary, of whom we know nothing whatever except through the testimony of their lives and words ? The bottom has fallen out of Christianity, why keep up the pretence of believing in it ?

That religion certainly started with a belief in the resurrection of its Founder, and in a similar resurrection awaiting His members. If it set out on its career with a lie in its right hand, it is unworthy of any decent man's attention. No one in that case need take seriously the

[1] See Appendix E, pp. 314 f., for the repeated assertion in the New Testament of what God did.

modern prophets who would have us think that only a trifling mistake occurred. All that really happened, they say, was that somehow the Apostles gained an assurance that the crucified Master was still alive in the other world in the same manner as other dead men were believed to be. How do the disbelievers in the resurrection know this? It is not so stated in the records. That is not the story—be it true or false—which they tell. They very definitely say how the conviction was arrived at. And which version of the story are we to accept? Baur's or Renan's or Pfleiderer's or Schmiedel's, or which one of the mutually contradictory theories that men are driven to set up, when once the plain straightforward faith of Christians is rejected? For we are not here concerned with some subsidiary matter of trifling importance one way or the other, but with the foundation fact of the Christian Faith, by which it stands or falls, as S. Paul said long ago—and the Church has re-echoed his voice from that day to this :—

I believe . . . He rose again the third day from the dead. . . .
I look for the resurrection of the dead . . . I believe in the resurrection of the flesh.

This is not an algebraic formula, intelligible only to the scientist, and leaving the moral sense cold. It lays hold on the moral sense with tenacious grip and dictates a mode of life.

This is why Christian writers and Christian preachers lay such stress on the distinctive doctrine of our faith. It is not to gratify curiosity about the future nor to create puzzles for the present. It is that the body, which has so glorious a future, should be held in honour and kept in purity and in obedience to God's natural laws and to His purposes of grace.

Identity between the present and the future body is the essential feature of the doctrine, and vital to its moral force. That explains why in crude times and amongst crude peoples it was expressed in crude terms with little insistence on the complementary truth.

How identity is maintained from the moment of conception through all the vicissitudes of life until death, is itself a mystery, but no one doubts the fact. This vital identity does not arise from identity of physical elements. The physical constituents of the body are in a constant state of flux. The tiny microscopic particle or atom [1] which starts building up the body is associated with changeable matter from the very first, and it goes on to the end taking up fresh matter which it temporarily endows with life, and discards when that has served its turn. In the course of a long life, this process will have repeated itself many times. It is obvious, therefore, that identity of the body during life is not constituted by the successive physical elements which have composed it, as far as it is evident to the senses. Much less can the identity between the body of this life and that of the next depend on the sameness of physical elements, since these are never the same to-day as they were yesterday.[2] The one persistent thing is the living atom, which began the body by aggregating to itself suitable elements from the external world and raising them for a time to a higher plane of being, as a plant does the mineral particles of the soil.

Have we here a clue [3] to the connecting link between the natural body and the spiritual body? May we conjecture that, when the soul departs at death from the body, and the last series of physical elements return to the earth whence they were taken, the original atom is preserved of God against the day of reunion with the purified soul? Much as speculation on a subject, which has not been revealed, is to be deprecated, this particular conjecture, so long as it is regarded strictly as a conjecture, seems to have much to recommend it.

Nor need it give us pause that the original atom must

[1] This word is here used in its popular sense.

Cf. Plato, *Symp.* 307 D, "and though a man never has the same things in him, yet he is called the same, but he is always becoming new and is always losing something in respect to hair and flesh and bones and blood and his whole body."

See Gregory of Nyssa, *De An. et Resur.*, P. G. Tom. 46, col. 141.

[2] Weissmann's theory as to the persistance of the germ-plasm is at least interesting in this connection.

be supposed to bear the imprint of the actions done in the earthly body, and to be capable of impressing on the spiritual body, which God shall in due time build [1] up from it, a summing up of its life on earth. Such a recapitulation, as we are imagining, is analogous to the beginning of the atom's separate life. Though so insignificant, so microscopic as to defy analysis, yet it transmits the records of a double line of ancestry, which branches out in arithmetical progression into ever-widening lines. Even in the new-born infant we can recognise likenesses to the parents or to grandparents. As the body matures, colour of eyes, of hair, of complexion, shape of features, tones of voice, tricks of speech and of gait can be referred back to forbears that the child has never seen or heard. That elusive thing, a family likeness, bears witness to the potency of the original germ, even when colouring, features, stature differ from those of the immediate parents ; and to its general fidelity to the past, though each has a certain individuality of its own, and is not a mechanical reproduction, a composite picture of converging lines of ancestors. But when all is said that can legitimately be said, we have to fall back on our ignorance [2] of the exact method which God will employ. At most we can only clear away misconceptions, and present the mystery as the Church consistently presents it in her Creeds, and as her most accepted writers have expressed it.[3]

[1] Note that the refashioning of the heavenly body is ascribed to the act of God and is not regarded as a mere "natural sequence." See the quotations in Appendix E.

[2] Cf. Dr. Plummer on 2 Cor. p. 136 :—"but in all these expressions, 'flesh' and 'spirit,' 'body' and 'soul,' 'higher and lower self,' it is impossible to define the differences with logical accuracy; our ignorance is too great."

[3] Canon Streeter gets very near the truth in an admirable passage in *Immortality*, pp. 96–110, and would indeed be in line with S. Augustine and S. Gregory of Nyssa, if only he would rid himself of the obsession that by "identity" the Church means the continuance in heaven of "flesh and blood" as we know them on earth. This quite unfounded idea is derived from Harnack and his congeners: cf. *History of Dogma*, vol. ii. p. 215, note. Harnack's vast knowledge of facts is a mine which can be dug into with profit, but his interpretation of documents is necessarily conditioned by his rejection of the Christian Creed.

In the section referred to, Canon Streeter asks :—"Ought we to affirm that in the next life there will still exist an organ of the expression of the activity of the spirit, which though not the same as the flesh and blood body of this life, has some recognisable analogy to it, and possibly even

It is not that God has left us in ignorance because He grudges us knowledge. It is rather that our present speech, derived ultimately from sense impressions, is very limited in its power of expressing spiritual things of which we can have no personal experience in this life. We do not know what it is like to be a disembodied spirit, nor how it functions. We do not know yet what a spiritual body is like. We at best know certain negative things about it; *e.g.* that it is not bound and tied by laws of space and time and sense, in the same manner as the earthly body is. We know positively by blessed spiritual experience that the only spiritual Body that yet exists, can, without leaving its natural seat at God's Right Hand, be present on ten thousand thousand Christian Altars, and be received as the food of the soul by myriads of Communicants, without suffering diminution, the true heavenly Bush of the desert, aflame and never consumed.

Beyond this we know nothing experimentally, and even here language faints and fails under the stress of meaning which it cannot adequately express. Indeed to the natural man all this sounds unintelligible. *Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him* (1 Cor. ii. 14). He is apt to wax contemptuous. The simpletons of Jesus Christ must e'en bear it.

One man had reached such heights of spiritual perception that he was admitted while still on earth to hear the language of heaven. But he bears witness that it cannot be rendered into human language.[1] He has warned us that at best our knowledge in this life is only partial: *We know in part, and we prophesy in part* (1 Cor. xiii. 9).

It was one of the consequences of the Incarnation that

some direct connection with it?" And, after a closely knit and convincing discussion tending to an affirmative answer, puts the further question:—"Is it material?" And sums up the section thus:—"We cannot deny the attribute 'material' in its strictly philosophic sense to the 'body' of the future life; though in the popular sense of the word 'material' we assuredly must do so." And so says the long line of Christian writers. Why then this hesitating and tentative way of expressing it?

[1] ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι, 2 Cor. xii. 4. ἐξὸν means "possible" rather than "lawful."

the Son of God had on earth to suffer the limitations of human speech. He accepted that as thoroughly as His other humiliations, and expressed Himself in the people's tongue, not in the difficult technical language of the philosophers. So, too, the New Testament is written in the common dialect of the time, not in the exquisite literary idiom, which had become a convention of authors and had ceased to be used in everyday life. It was the "common people" who "heard Him gladly," and to the common people the records of His teaching were addressed by His authorised under-teachers. Philosophers must stoop to the common tongue, in token of humility, if they are to have their share, too, in the Gospel message.

The language of heaven, which alone can describe properly the life of heaven and heavenly existences such as the spiritual body, would be as unintelligible to earth-dwellers as Chinese is to the ordinary Englishman, or English to a Bushman.

It is, then, in no grudging spirit that the knowledge of much that we would like to know is denied us, and we must make shift to make the best use of what we do know, though that be imperfect. We can be quite sure that no error which is the genuine outcome of the inadequacy of human language, or of any involuntary failure to grasp its meaning, will be remembered against us. A Christian man's condemnation of error in religious matters must be firm and unhesitating because of the harm that error causes to men's souls, but he must be clear of the presumption which would assess the blame attaching to any particular upholder of error. That is the sole prerogative of God, who knows all. If in the foregoing pages error is unsparingly denounced, as it ought to be, it would be a charity for the reader to remember that it is the misbelief or the unbelief that is stigmatised, not the misbeliever or unbeliever. Reader and writer no less than they must sue for mercy. But there must be no conscious paltering with truth or truckling to untruth. Truth is not ours to play with, and untruth is a pernicious thing.

There is no lack of clear light to steer by. That is the

main purpose of religion. But the unfolding of mysteries in their fulness belongs to the future and will be one of the joyous occupations as we follow on to know even as we are known.

No less surely should we set store by the partial disclosures of truth, which are alone possible under our present limitations of mind and speech; especially when they are part of the light which is to guide us in the affairs of practical life. We know enough about the resurrection of the body to see that it deeply concerns our whole personal and social life in this world and our happiness in the next.

But we do not know, and shall not know, until the event declares it, the exact answer to the many questions that our speculative reason can put to us. Our partial knowledge, which is all that is possible about heavenly things whilst we are still on earth, will be expanded, not stultified, by the fuller knowledge hereafter.

* * * * * *

The reader has now before him a review of the Christian doctrine of resurrection as held by the Church and expressed by her accepted teachers of many lands and of varying nationality, temperament, standing, and ability. The witnesses agree about its essential features. They find those in the belief that in some ineffable manner, the precise nature of which God has kept to Himself, the body which functions now will be raised up then, the same yet not the same [1]: the identity is not swallowed up by the mighty change that has taken place, nor has the adaptation to a totally different environment wiped out the identity.

The doctrine is left to commend itself by its intrinsic reasonableness. It must always be premised, however, that every article of faith must by the very nature of things pass beyond the limits of the natural reason. The region of life which the sun of natural reason can illuminate with its full brilliance is confined to our present experience. Anything beyond that can only be of the nature of a penumbra,

[1] It is most important that the reader should observe the ambiguity of this word "same" when used of the risen body; "same" implies substantial identity, but allows a difference in qualities.

as far as the light of reason is concerned. Happily it is just here that faith lifts up her torch, and supplies us with sufficient light, by which to direct our footsteps, until faith is lost in sight.

There is a check, however, still imposed by reason on what claim to be disclosures of faith. They must never ask us to accept anything which plainly contradicts reason. They may be discoveries, which reason unaided could never make for herself, but even then reason has a legitimate function. She must test and probe without flinching. God cannot contradict Himself. His gift of reason and His gift of faith must be mutually accordant. Hence the Apostolic injunctions: *Prove all things; hold fast that which is good* (1 Thess. v. 21); *Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God* (1 John iv. 1). It is not without bearing on our present subject, that the test which S. John suggests goes to the root of the matter: *Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God* (iv. 2, 3). It is a historical fact which cannot be questioned, that every type of ancient or modern Docetism has also denied the resurrection of the body. On the other hand, the Christian belief that the Son of God assumed and retains true, proper, and complete humanity, equally holds that He will raise up man in genuine completeness, body no less than soul.

This treatise set out to lay before the reader the precise words on this subject of representative Christians in every age. In most cases you have before you every relevant word in their extant works. Where a selection had to be made, as in the case of voluminous writers like Origen or S. Augustine, a real effort has been made to leave out no side of their manifold witness. At the same time, no important utterance of any writer of eminence has been knowingly omitted. Above all, there has been no conscious admission or exclusion of recorded opinion on the ground that it told for or against the general belief of Christians. All use of italics or other typographical devices to emphasise telling sentences has been deliberately avoided. The

reader is left to find these out for himself. In a word, the writer has been at pains to present the evidence with entire objectivity, without in the least concealing his own unfeigned acceptance of the Church's consistent and unhesitating faith throughout the ages. Theological deductions explanatory of that faith have varied at times, but on the whole amazingly little. These, of course, are in a different position from the faith itself, and stand or fall in the reader's estimation according to the weight he attaches to the arguments adduced, and his valuation of their author's authority.

At all events the reader is in possession of the main facts, and can determine for himself how much, if any, justification there is for attributing to the general current of Christian teaching about the resurrection a gross and "materialistic" tendency. It is claimed that the evidence shows this too common assertion to be, if not totally unfounded, at least grossly exaggerated. The few hundred scholars, who really know the Fathers and later writers, are far too apt to shrug their shoulders and let such mischievous statements pass unchallenged.

It is hoped, too, that all who have attentively studied the evidence now laid before them will rise from the perusal with a deepened sense of the vital importance to the Christian faith of the eleventh article of the Baptismal Creed: *I believe in the Resurrection of the flesh*—of vital importance for right living as well as for feeding our souls with stimulating anticipations of the future happiness of the whole man. The most glowing pictures of poet, mystic, and seer will fall far short of the reality.

Lex [1] membrorum animalis [2] Erit plene mortua, Nova caro spiritalis Erit menti subdita. Vivaque vis sensualis Rationi consona.	Nature's Law which bound our members Will be dead and done away, Flesh, renewed and spirit-moulded, Will the sovran mind obey. And the quickened force of feeling Owns the reason's perfect sway.

[1] From a hymn published in full by Mone, *Hym. Lat.* Tom. 1, pp. 433-6. It is ascribed to S. Thomas à Kempis, but Julian and J. M. Neale thought it was by an unknown writer of the fifteenth century influenced by him, *Hymnol.* p. 579.

[2] Cf. S. Augustine: Sicut nunc corpus animale dicitur, quod tamen corpus, non anima est, ita tunc spirituale corpus erit, corpus tamen non spiritus erit, *Enchirid*, 23, P. L. Tom. 40, col. 274.

In te florens pulcritudo
Supra solem fulgida,
Velox nimis promptitudo
Pro ut vult agillima,
Præpotensque fortitudo,
Virtus ut angelica.

There the body blooms in beauty
More than sun of brightest sheen,
Free it moves and swift, and ready
At the slightest wish, and keen.
And, like conquering might of Angels,
Its prevailing strength is seen.

In te durat longitudo
Sempiterna temporis,
Quæ plena beatitudo
Reformati corporis,
In hac par similitudo
Redemptis et angelis.

There lasts on the endless length'ning
Of a time that ever is,
Whence the body all refashioned
Draws deep plenitude of bliss,
And the ransomed, and the Angels,
Share high fellowship in this.

O quam vere gloriosum[1]
Eris corpus fragile,
Cum fueris tam formosum,
Forte, sanum, agile,
Liberum, voluptuosum
In ævum durabile.[2]

O how glorious and resplendent,
Fragile body, shalt thou be,
When endued with so much beauty,
Full of health, and strong and free
Full of vigour, full of pleasure,
That shall last eternally.

Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him (1 Cor. ii. 9 from Isa. lxiv. 4).

[1] Cf. S. Hilary: natura carnis post resurrectionem glorificatur, in *Ps.* ii. *c.* 27, P. L. Tom. 9, col. 278.

[2] The whole of this hymn was translated by Dr. Neale in *The Joys and Glories of Paradise*, pp. 55–63. Some stanzas from it, beginning with "Light's abode, celestial Salem," form 232 of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. The three first of the stanzas quoted here are not among the successful efforts of the accomplished translator. They are here given from a version by the Rev. A. H. Trevor Benson.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF בָּשָׂר IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE Hebrews had no single proper word for "body." [1] They did not feel the need of a separate word, because to them the body was so intimately a part of the complete human being. Hence there is no trace in purely Hebrew writing of the Platonic or Stoic or Buddhist idea that the body is inherently evil.[2] To them the body is not necessarily evil, nor the source of sin.

The word most usually translated "body" in A.V. is בָּשָׂר, which is uniformly represented by "flesh" in the R.V., except in Isa. x. 18 and Ezek. x. 12. LXX renders by κρέας, χρώς, σῶμα, βροτός (once Job x. 4), ἄνθρωπος (once Job xii. 10), but most commonly by σάρξ.

To arrive at the meaning of σάρξ in the New Testament it will be necessary to analyse the use of בָּשָׂר and its equivalents

[1] Cf. I. Abrahams in *Encycl. Bibl.* vol. ii. p. 772.

Gewiyah, a rare word, is the nearest approach to a word meaning the body as distinguished from the spirit: =a living human body, Gen. xlvii. 18, Neh. ix. 37, Nah. iii. 3; =a dead human body, 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, 12, Ps. cvi. 6; ="body" of cherubim, Ezek. i. 11, 23; ="body" of the vision-man, Dan. x. 6; =body of dead lion, Judges xiv. 8, 9. The word is in common use in post-biblical Hebrew, cf. last line of Synagogue Morning Hymn, Adon Olam, Singer's Authorised Jewish Prayer-book, p. 3.

[2] Wisdom ix. 15, "For a corruptible body weigheth down the soul, and the earthly frame lieth heavy on the mind that is full of cares," is quoted by some writers as teaching the doctrine that the body is inherently evil. But Goodrick in his admirable edition of the Book of Wisdom easily disposes of this theory. See his comment on ix. 15, and additional note A, pp. 382–88. Holmes in *Apoc. and Pseudep.* vol. i. p. 550, is more hesitating, but he says: "The writer no doubt was somewhat influenced by the Greek idea of the inherent evil of matter, though he probably did not accept it. It is quite possible to admit that it is the occasion of evil without accepting the dualistic theory that it is the cause of evil." The most orthodox of Christian devotional writers might be quoted freely for this sentiment.

Professor Burton, *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, p. 169, sums up his investigation of Jewish-Greek literature to which Wisdom belongs: "Nowhere does there appear a clearly defined or certainly implied dualistic doctrine attributing to matter an evil quality." "It (σάρξ) is nowhere used to express the notion that matter is the source or cause of moral evil" (p. 172).

in the Old Testament, and then of σάρξ in the Greek Version of the Old Testament.

בָּשָׂר has five distinct meanings: (1) "flesh," used as food, "flesh" of dead animals, and even of human beings eaten in famine; (2) "flesh" of living human beings; (3) "flesh" =anything having animal life, including human beings; (4) =blood relationship, blood relatives; (5) "flesh"=humanity in its completeness, whole human nature with emphasis on its frailty and mortality.

(1) בָּשָׂר="*flesh*" *as food, of animal sacrifices*, translated in Greek Bible by:—

Κρέας (Gen. ix. 4). "But 'flesh' with the life thereof . . ."; Exod. xii. 8, xvi. 3, 8, 12, xxi. 28, xxii. 31, xxix. 2, 14, 31, 32, 34; Lev. vi. 27, vii. 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, viii. 17, 31, 32, ix. 11; xi. 8, 11, xvi. 27; Num. xi. 4, 13, 18, 21, 33, xviii. 18, xix. 5; Deut. xii. 15, 20, 23, 27, xiv. 8, xvi. 4, xxviii. 53; Judges vi. 19, 20, 21; 1 Sam. ii. 13, 15; 1 Kings xvii. 6, xix. 21 ("flesh" omitted in LXX); Ps. l. 13 (Grk. xlix. 13); Prov. xxiii. 20; Isa. xxii. 13, xliv. 16, 19, lxv. 14; lxvi. 17; Jer. vii. 21, xi. 15; Ezek. iv. 15, xi. 3, 7 (and xi. 11 in *Codex Marchalianus*), xxiv. 10, xxxix. 17, 18, xl. 43 ("flesh" omitted by LXX); Dan. x. 3; Hos. viii. 13; Mic. iii. 3; Hag. ii. 12.

By σάρξ mostly in plural, Gen. xl. 19 (baker's "flesh" as food for vultures); Gen. xli. 2, 3, 4, 18, 19 (of the fat-*fleshed* and lean-*fleshed* kine); Lev. iv. 11 (of the bullock of the sin-offering), xxvi. 29 ("flesh" of children eaten in famine), compare Deut. xxviii. 55, where κρέα is used for same in verse 53; 2 Kings ix. 36 (Jezebel's "flesh" to be eaten by dogs); Job xli. 23[1] (Grk. xli. 14); Ps. xxvii. 2 (Grk. xxvi. 2), lxxviii. 27 (Grk. lxxvii. 27), lxxix. 2 (Grk. lxxviii. 2) (of "flesh" of saints as food for fowls of air); Isa. ix. 20 ("flesh" of a man's own arm gnawed in pain), xxxi. 3 ("flesh" of horses), xlix. 26 (oppressors made to eat their own "flesh"); Jer. xix. 9 ("they shall eat the 'flesh' of their children"; Ezek. xxxii. 5 ("flesh" of men as food for vultures), compare xxxix. 17, 18, where κρέα is used; Dan. vii. 5 (probably "flesh" of animals); Mic. iii. 3.

[1] Wendt, as translated by Professor Dickson in *S. Paul's Use of the Terms 'Body and Spirit,'* pp. 404–412, says (p. 405): "It is perhaps by no mere accident that not a single passage occurs where *basar* denotes the body of an animal." This is an amazing statement in face of the fact that *basar* is used of the bodies of animals offered in sacrifice and of animals eaten as food some dozens of times. It is used of the bodies of living animals, but less frequently, cf. Job xli 23, Isa. xxxi. 3, and Gen. xli. 2, 3, 4, 18, 19.

(2) בָּשָׂר=*human flesh, the flesh of living human beings*, translated in Greek Bible by :—

χρώς, Exod. xxviii. 42 (" linen breeches to cover the ' flesh ' of the priest's nakedness ") ; in Lev. xiii. χρώς is used of the leper's " flesh " in verses 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, and σάρξ in verses 10, 18, 24, 38, 39, 43, and σῶμα in xiv. 9, whilst χρώς and σῶμα are used in the same verse, Lev. xvi. 4, for the priest's " flesh," χρώς also for human " flesh " in Lev. xv. 7.

σῶμα, Lev. xv. 2, 3, 11, 13, 16, 19, 21, 27, xvi. 4, 24, 26, 28, xvii. 16, xix. 28, xxii. 6 ; Num. viii. 7, xix. 7, 8 ; 1 Kings xxi. 27 (Grk. xx. 27) ; Job vii. 5.

κρέας, Job x. 11, compare Deut. xxxii. 42 (in A.V.).

But " flesh " of living men is most commonly translated in Greek Bible by σάρξ used both in singular and plural and with and without the article :—

Gen. ii. 21, 23 (" flesh " of Adam), xvii. 11, 13, 14, 24, 25 (" flesh " of foreskin, verse 23 is omitted in Greek), xxxiv. 24 ; Exod. iv. 7, xxx. 32 ; Lev. xii. 3, xxi. 5 (observe in the parallel passage, xix. 28, σῶμα is used) ; Num. xii. 12 ; Judges viii. 7 ; 2 Kings iv 34, v. 10, 14, vi. 30 ; Job ii. 5, iv. 15, vi. 12, xiii. 14, xiv. 22, xix. 20 (in verse 26 " flesh " is omitted in Grk.), xxi. 6, xxxiii. 21, 25 ; Ps. xvi. 9 (Grk. xv. 9), xxxviii. 3, 7 (Grk. xxxvii. 4, 8), lxiii. 1 (Grk. lxii. 1), lxxiii. 26 (Grk. lxxii. 26), lxxxiv. 2 (Grk. lxxxiii. 2), cii. 5 (Grk. ci. 6), cix. 24 (Grk. cviii. 24), cxix. 120 (Grk. cxviii. 120) ; Prov. xiv. 30 has plural בְּשָׂרִים here, the only instance in Old Testament, but LXX followed a different text ; Eccl. ii. 3 (=the frail side of man), iv. 5, v. 6, xi. 10, xii. 12 ; Isa. x. 18 (" both soul and body " *of his forest and fruitful field*, a bold metaphor for highly placed and prosperous men), xvii. 4 (LXX *τὰ πίονα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*, for " the fatness of his ' flesh ' ") ; Lam. iii. 4 ; Ezek. xi. 19 (compare xxxvi. 26), xxiii. 20, xxxvii. 6, 8, xliv. 7, 9 ; Dan. i. 15 (for " flesh " of Daniel and the Three Children, Theodotion has *ταῖς σαρξί*, LXX *ἡ ἕξις τοῦ σώματος*) ; Mic. iii. 2 ; Zech. xiv. 12.

(3) בָּשָׂר=*living creatures, animal life in general, including man*, translated in Greek Bible by σάρξ.

Gen. vi. 17, 19 (" *to destroy all flesh*," " every living thing of *all flesh* "), vii. 15, 16, 21, viii. 17, ix. 11, 15, 16, 17 ; Lev. xvii. 11, 14 ; Num. xviii. 15 ; Ps. cxxxvi. 25 (Grk. cxxxv. 25) ; Dan. iv. 12 (Grk. iv. 9).

(4) בָּשָׂר=*relationship by blood, blood relations* (שְׁאֵר is more frequently used in this sense), translated in Greek Bible by σάρξ:—

Gen. xxix. 14, xxxvii. 27 ; Lev. xviii. 6 (*οἰκεῖα σαρκὸς οὐτοῦ*

(for Heb. "flesh of his flesh" compare Lev. xxv. 49); Judges ix. 2; 2 Sam. v. 1, xix. 12, 13; 1 Chron. xi. 1; Neh. v. 5 (Grk. 2 Esdras xv. 5).

(5) בָּשָׂר=*the whole man, humanity* in its completeness, including the soul as well as body, *human nature* with emphasis on its frailty and mortality, translated in Greek Bible by σάρξ with three exceptions, viz. by βροτός in Job x. 4; by ἄνθρωπος in Gen. vi. 13 (καιρὸς παντὸς ἀνθρώπου="the time of *all flesh*"); and in Job xii. 10.

By σάρξ, Gen. ii. 24 ("they two shall be *one flesh*," *i.e.* "human nature completed": the literal meaning precedes the sacramental meaning of the unity betwixt man and wife), vi. 3, 12; Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16; Deut. v. 26 (Grk. v. 23); Job xxxiv. 15 (balanced by βροτός in second part of verse); Ps. xxviii. 7 (Grk. xxvii. 7) (combined with καρδία to express man's whole nature), lvi. 4 (Grk. lv. 5), lxv. 2 (Grk. lxiv. 3), lxxviii. 39 (Grk. lxxvii. 39), cxlv. 21 (Grk. cxliv. 21); Prov. iv. 22; Isa. xl. 5, xlix. 26, lxvi. 16, 23, 24; Jer. xii. 12, xvii. 5 (Heb. "that trusteth in man and maketh *flesh* his arm"; LXX "that trusteth in man, and will lean the *flesh* of his arm upon him," *i.e.* on man), xxv. 31 (Grk. xxxii. 17), xxxii. 27 (Grk. xxxix. 27), xlv. 5 (Grk. li. 35); Ezek. xi. 19 ("I will give them a heart of flesh" (καρδίαν σαρκίνην), *i.e.* a tender, human heart), xx. 48 (Grk. xxi. 4), (Grk. xxi. 9), xxi. 5 (Grk. xxi. 10), xxi. 7 (Grk. xxi. 12); Dan. ii. 11 ("the Gods *whose dwelling is not with flesh*," in Theodotion, ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ κατοικία μετὰ πάσης σαρκός, in LXX, οὗ οὐκ ἔστι κατοικητήριον αὐτοῦ μετὰ πάσης σαρκός); Joel ii. 28, (Grk. iii. 1); Zech. ii. 13 (Grk. ii. 17).

N.B.—Professor Burton, in *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, p. 73, sums up his analysis of בָּשָׂר in Old Testament: "Of any corrupting power of either body or flesh to drag down the soul, there is no trace in the Old Testament. The בָּשָׂר is sometimes spoken of as weak, but never as a power of evil."

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF σάρξ IN GREEK OLD TESTAMENT

σάρξ in Old Testament is used for בָּשָׂר "flesh" in all its five distinct meanings :—

(1) σάρξ="*flesh*" *as food, and* (*rarely*) *the flesh of living animals* :— [1]

Gen. xl. 19, baker's *flesh* to be eaten by birds ; xli. 2, 3, 4, 18, 19, *flesh* of kine, in Pharaoh's dream.

Lev. iv. 11, *flesh* of sin-offering ; xxvi. 29, *flesh* of children eaten in famine.

1 Sam. xvii. 44, Goliath's threat to give David's *flesh* to the fowls of the air.

2 Kings ix. 36, Elijah's prophecy that the dogs would eat Jezebel's *flesh*.

Job xix. 22, "why are ye not filled with my *flesh*" ; xxxi. 31, a demand to be filled with Job's *flesh* ; xli. 23 (Grk. xli. 14), "the *flakes of* Leviathan's flesh," σάρκες σώματος αὐτοῦ : ℵ omits σώματος.

Ps. xxvii. 2 (Grk. xxvi. 2), "when evildoers came upon me to eat up my *flesh*" ; lxxviii. 27 (Grk. lxxvii. 27), "He rained *flesh* upon them as the dust" ; lxxix. 2 (Grk. lxxviii. 2), "and the *flesh* of Thy saints unto the beasts of the earth."

Isa. ix. 20, "they shall eat every man the *flesh* of his own arm" ; xxxi. 3, "their horses are *flesh* and not spirit," LXX construction of clause different ; xlix. 26, "I will feed them . . . with their own *flesh*."

Jer. xix. 9, "I will cause them to eat the *flesh* of their sons and of their daughters, and . . . the *flesh* of their friend."

Ezek. xxxii. 5,[2] "I will lay thy *flesh* upon the mountains.'

Dan. vii. 5, "devour much *flesh*."

Mic. iii. 3, "who also eat the *flesh* of my people, . . . they chop them in pieces as *flesh* for the cauldrons."

[1] Zech. xi. 15, He shall eat the *flesh*"—בְּשַׂר ; the LXX has κρέας.
[2] But see Ezek. xxiii. 20 (σάρκες is there used in the sense of αἰδοῖα).

Twenty times—13 referring to human flesh, 4 to animals, 3 to living creatures.

(2) σάρξ=*living human flesh, the human body* :—

Gen. ii. 21, "and closed up the *flesh*"; ii. 23, ". . . and *flesh* of my *flesh*"; xvii. 11, 13, 14, 24, 25, and xxxiv. 24, "circumcised in the *flesh*."

Exod. iv. 7, "it was turned again as his other *flesh*"; xxx. 32, "upon the *flesh* of man it shall not be poured."

Lev. xii. 3, "circumcised in the *flesh*"; xiii. 10, 18, 24, 38, 39, 43, the *flesh* of a leper; xxi. 5, "nor make any cuttings in their *flesh*."

Num. xii. 12, the Greek, "it eats the half of her *flesh*," following a different pointing from the Masoretic text, which is translated in R.V.

Judges viii. 7, "I will tear your *flesh* with the thorns."

2 Kings iv. 34, "the *flesh* of the child waxed warm"; v. 10, 14, "thy *flesh* shall come again," "his *flesh* came again as the *flesh* of a little child"; vi. 30, "he had sackcloth within upon his *flesh*."

Job ii. 5, "touch . . . his *flesh*"; iv. 15, "the hair of my *flesh* stood up"; vi. 12, "Is my *flesh* brass;" xiii. 14, "take my *flesh* in my teeth"; xiv. 22, "but his *flesh* upon him hath pain"; xvi. 18, "O earth, cover not my blood," Greek adds, "of my *flesh*"; xix. 20, "my bone cleaveth to my skin and to my *flesh*," Greek has, "within my skin my *flesh* is corrupted"; xxi. 6, "horror taketh hold on my *flesh*"; xxxiii. 21, "his *flesh* is consumed away"; xxxiii. 25, "his *flesh* shall be fresher than a child's."

Ps. xvi. 9 (Grk. xv. 9), "my *flesh* also shall dwell in safety"; xxviii. 7 (xxvii. 7), instead of "my heart rejoiceth greatly," Greek has "my *flesh* has revived"; xxxviii. 3, 7 (xxxvii. 4, 8) "no soundness in my *flesh*"; lxiii. 1 (lxii. 2), "my *flesh* longeth for Thee"; lxxxiv. 2 (lxxxiii. 3), "my heart and my *flesh* cry out"; cii. 5 (ci. 6), "my bones cleave to my *flesh*"; cix. 24 (cviii. 24), "my *flesh* of fatness," Greek, "my *flesh* is changed by reason of (want of) oil"; cxix. 120 (cxviii. 120), "my *flesh* trembleth for fear of Thee," Greek, "Penetrate my *flesh* with Thy fear."

Prov. iii. 22, after "so shall they be life unto thy soul, and grace to thy neck," the Greek had an additional distich, "and they shall be healing to thy *flesh* and safety to thy bones"; iv. 22, "and health to all their *flesh*"; v. 11 "when thy *flesh*

and thy body are consumed," Greek, "when the *flesh* of thy body is consumed."

Eccl. ii. 3, for "I searched in mine heart how to cheer my *flesh* with wine," Greek has, "I searched whether my heart would draw my *flesh* as wine"; iv. 5, "the fool foldeth his hands together and eateth his own *flesh*"; v. 6, "Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy *flesh* to sin"; xi. 10, "remove sorrow from thy *flesh*"; xii. 12, "study is a weariness of the *flesh*."

Isa. x. 18, "he shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his beautiful field, both soul and *body*," ἀπὸ ψυχῆς ἕως σαρκῶν.

Jer. ix. 25, "all the nations are uncircumcised," Greek adds, "in *flesh*."

Lam. iii. 4, "my *flesh* . . . hath he made old."

Ezek. x. 12, the ordinary Greek text leaves בְּשָׂרֵ untranslated. (R.V. "body"), of the cherubim, but *Codex Marchalianus* translates in full, καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ σάρκες αὐτῶν; xi. 19 and xxxvi. 26, "I will take the stony heart out of their (your) *flesh* and I will give them (you) an *heart of flesh*" (καρδίαν σαρκίνην); xxiii. 20, "whose *flesh* is as (the flesh) of asses"; xxxvii. 6, "will bring up *flesh* upon you"; xxxvii. 8, "and *flesh* came upon them"; xliv. 7, 9, "uncircumcised in *flesh*."

Dan. i. 15, for "*fatter in flesh*" Theodotion has, ἰσχυροὶ ταῖς σαρξὶν ὑπὲρ . . ., LXX ἡ ἕξις τοῦ σώματος κρείσσων . . .; iv. 31. In LXX occur several verses here, which amplify the Masoretic text, and among them the phrase, "my *flesh* and my heart were changed" (Cambridge University Press Greek Bible, vol. iii. p. 532).

Zech. xiv. 12, "their *flesh* shall consume away."

(3) σάρξ=*animal life in general, including man*:—

Gen. vi. 17, "to destroy all *flesh*, in which is the breath of life"; vi. 19, "of every living thing of all *flesh*"; vii. 15, 16, "of all *flesh*"; vii. 21, "all *flesh* died"; viii. 17, "bring forth with thee every living thing that is with thee of all *flesh*"; viii. 21, "neither will I smite any more *every living thing*" (Heb. בָּל־חָי, Greek πᾶσαν σάρκα ζῶσαν); ix. 11, 15 (bis); xvi. 17, "all *flesh*."

Lev. xvii. 11, "for the life of the *flesh* is in the blood"; xvii. 14, "ye shall eat the blood of no manner of *flesh*, for the life of all *flesh* is the blood thereof."

Num. xviii. 15, "everything that openeth the womb of all *flesh*"; Ps. cxxxvi. 25, "He giveth food to all *flesh*."

Dan. iv. 12 (Grk. iv. 9), "and all *flesh* was fed of it."

(4) σάρξ = *blood relationship, and concretely blood relations* :—

Gen. xxix. 14, "Surely thou art my bone and my *flesh*"; xxxvii. 27, "he is our brother, our *flesh*."

Judges ix. 2, "I am your bone and your *flesh*."

2 Sam. v. 1, "We are thy bone and thy *flesh*"; xix. 12, 13, "my bone and my *flesh*."

1 Chron. xi. 1, "Behold, we are thy bone and thy *flesh*."

Neh. v. 5 (Grk. 2 Esdras xv. 5), "Yet now our *flesh* is as the *flesh* of our brethren."

(5) σάρξ = *the whole man, complete human nature, humanity in its entirety with emphasis on its frailty and mortality*. Heb. בָּשָׂר.

Gen. ii. 24, "and they two shall be one *flesh*" (καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν); vi. 3, "for that he also is *flesh*," *i.e.* mere mortal man; vi. 12, "for all *flesh* (*i.e.* the whole human race) had corrupted his way." N.B.—In vi. 13, the same Hebrew phrase is in LXX, παντὸς ἀνθρώπου, "the end *of all flesh*," in R.V.

Num. xvi. 22 and xxvii. 16,[1] "the God of the spirits of all *flesh*," *i.e.* of the whole of humanity.

Deut. v. 26 (Grk. v. 23), "for who is there of all *flesh*" (Grk. τίς γὰρ σὰρξ ἥτις ἤκουσε φωνήν . . ., *i.e.* what mortal man that heard the voice . . .).

Job xxxiv. 15, "All *flesh* shall perish together" (πᾶσα σάρξ answers to πᾶς βροτός in the second half of the verse).

Ps. xxviii. 7 (xxvii. 7), for "my heart rejoiceth greatly" the Greek has, "my *flesh* (*i.e.* my whole nature) revived," (ἀνέθαλεν ἡ σάρξ μου) lvi. 4 (lv. 5), "I will not be afraid what *flesh* (*i.e.* frail man) can do unto me"; lxv. 2 (lxiv. 3), "unto Thee shall all *flesh* (*i.e.* all men) come"; lxxviii. 39 (lxxvii. 39), "He remembered that they were but *flesh*," *i.e.* mere frail human beings; cxlv. 21 (cxliv. 21), "let all *flesh* (*i.e.* all mankind) bless His holy Name."

Prov. xxvi. 10. In this verse, which is almost unintelligible in the Hebrew, LXX has πολλὰ χειμάζεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἀφρόνων, "The *whole human pack* of fools suffers much hardship."

Isa. x. 18, "both soul and body" (ἀπὸ ψυχῆς ἕως σαρκῶν) expresses the whole humanity of the exalted persons spoken of in the metaphor; xl. 5, "All *flesh* (=all mankind) shall see it together"; xl. 6, "*All flesh* is grass"; xlix. 26, "*all flesh* shall know"; lxvi. 10, "For by the fire will the Lord plead, and by His *sword* with *all flesh*," *i.e.* with the whole of humanity:

[1] Here more or less in the Alexandrian sense.

LXX ἐν γὰρ τῷ πυρὶ κριθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, καὶ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ αὐτοῦ πᾶσα σάρξ, a slightly different reading; lxvi. 23, "all *flesh* (=all men) shall come to worship"; lxvi. 24, "they shall be an abhorring unto *all flesh*," *i.e.* unto the whole human race.

Jer. xii. 12, "*no flesh* hath peace," *i.e.* not a single human creature; xvii. 5, "and maketh *flesh* (=mere man) his arm" (Grk. "and will lean his arm of *flesh* upon him"); xxv. 31 (Grk. xxxii. 31), "He will plead with *all flesh*," *i.e.* with the whole human race; xxxii. 27 (Grk. xxxix. 27), "I am the Lord, the God of *all flesh*," *i.e.* of all humanity; xlv. 5 (Grk. li. 35), "I will bring evil on *all flesh*," *i.e.* on every man without exception.

Ezek. xxi. 4, "My sword shall go forth out of his sheath against *all flesh*," *i.e.* all human beings; xxi. 5, "*all flesh* shall know that I . . ."; xxi. 7 (Grk. inserts "*all flesh and*" before "every spirit" to make the inclusion of all humanity more complete).

Dan. ii. 11, "the gods, whose dwelling is not with *flesh*," *i.e.* with men. So Theodotion with the addition of "all" before *flesh*. In LXX "the angel, whose habitation is not with all *flesh*."

Joel ii. 28, "I will pour out My Spirit upon *all flesh*."

Zech. ii. 13, "be silent, *all flesh*, before the Lord."

APPENDIX C

AN ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF σάρξ IN THE DEUTERO-CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

(1) σάρξ does not occur in these books in the sense of the flesh of animals, and only twice in the sense of *human flesh* as food, viz. in

Baruch ii. 3, "that we should eat every man the *flesh* of his own son, and every man the *flesh* of his own daughter."

Wisdom xii. 5, "sacrificial banquets of men's *flesh* and of blood."

(2) σάρξ=*living human flesh* :—

Judith xiv. 10, "circumcised the *flesh* of his foreskin"; xvi. 17, "to put fire and worms in their *flesh*."

Wisdom xix. 21, "flames wasted not the *flesh* of perishable creatures" (possibly this includes all living creatures).

Ecclus. xix. 21, "as an arrow that sticketh in the *flesh* of the thigh"; xxv. 26, "cut her off from thy *flesh*"; xliv. 20, "in his *flesh* he established the covenant."

1 Macc. vii. 17, a quotation from Ps. lxxix. 2 (lxxviii. 2).

2 Macc. ix. 9, "so that . . . while he was still living . . . his *flesh* fell off."

2 Macc. vi. 6, "the old man tore his *flesh* with scourges"; vii. 13, "when his *flesh* was completely relaxed"; vii. 18, "these alone can master the sufferings of the *flesh*"; ix. 17, "burn my *flesh*"; ix. 20, "his *flesh* twisted round the axles of the machine"; ix. 28, "the tigerish beasts tore off his *flesh* complete"; x. 8, "he saw his *flesh* rent off"; xv. 15, "she saw the *flesh* of her children consumed with fire"; xv. 20, "beholding the *flesh* of her children hewn off atop the *flesh* of her children."

(3) σάρξ=*any creature that has life* :—

Ecclus. i. 10, "She is with *all flesh* according to His gift"; xiii. 16, "all *flesh* consorteth according to kind"; xvii. 4, "He put the fear of man on *all flesh*"; xl. 8, with *all flesh* from man to beast."

(4) *σάρξ*=" *relationship by blood*," does not occur in these books.

(5) *σάρξ*=*humanity, mankind, man* :—

Judith ii. 3, " they decreed to destroy *all flesh* (*i.e.* all men) which followed not the word of his mouth " ; x. 13, " there shall not belacking of his men one *person* nor one life" (*οὐ διαφωνήσει τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτοῦ σὰρξ μία οὐδὲ πνεῦμα ζωῆς*).[1]

Wisdom vii. 2, " in the womb of a mother was I moulded into *flesh*," *i.e.* became a man, a human being.[2]

Ecclus. xiv. 17,[3] " *all flesh* (*i.e.* all mankind) waxeth old as a garment " ; xiv. 18, " so also of the generations of *flesh* and blood " ; xvii. 4, " an evil man will think on *flesh* and blood " ; xviii. 13, " the mercy of the Lord is upon *all flesh* " ; xxviii. 5, " he being himself *flesh* (*i.e.* though but a mortal man) nourisheth wrath " ; xxviii. 5, " Give not thyself over to *anybody* " (*μὴ ἀλλάξῃς σεαυτὸν πάσῃ σαρκί*) ; xxxix. 19, " the works of *all flesh* are before Him " ; xli. 3, " This is the sentence from the Lord over *all flesh* " ; xliv. 18, " that *all flesh* should no more be blotted out by a flood ; " xlv. 1 (Grk. xliv. 27), " which found favour in the sight of *all flesh* " ; xlv. 4, " He chose him out of *all flesh* " ; xlvi. 19, " I have not taken any man's goods, so much a shoe " (*ἕως ὑποδημάτων ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκὸς οὐκ εἴληφα . . .*).

Bel and Dragon 5, " and hath sovereignty over *all flesh*."

[1] Cf. xiv. 10.
[2] Cf. xii. 15.
[3] Only here in contrast to God. Cf. i. 8 ; xiii. 15.

APPENDIX D

ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF σάρξ ("FLESH") IN NEW TESTAMENT

No better example of the adaptation of the Greek language to be the vehicle for the propagation of the Gospel can be found than the word σάρξ. In classical Greek this word is used exclusively for the literal, palpable, tangible "flesh" of the human body.[1] But in the Greek Bible, as representing the Hebrew word for "flesh," בָּשָׂר, it took on all the rich range of meaning of that word; lower, in that it could be used of the "flesh" of animals used as food, and higher, in that it could express the idea of living creatures, and finally of man himself in the completeness of his complex being. Usage had thus provided a word, with a long Hebrew ancestry behind it, which was ready to the hand of S. John to set forth the sublime mystery of the Incarnation: καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. The WORD was made FLESH,[2] the most stupendous event in the history of the universe, expressed in words of a startling simplicity.

The writers of the New Testament take the word "flesh" as it had been fashioned for them by the usage of the Greek Old Testament, and while discarding almost wholly its lower meanings, extend still further its capacity for conveying ethical meanings. The following brief survey of all the passages in which the word occurs will convey this to the student in a manner that no general description, no matter how incisive, could effect.

In our analysis of Old Testament usage, we saw that the

[1] Cf. Professor Burton's *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, p. 51. "Σάρξ is throughout the classical period a purely physical term, adding to the original sense of flesh only, and by easy *synecdoche*, the meaning 'body.' It is applied to men and to the lower animals, but mostly the former. It has no psychical or ethical meaning."

[2] Note that in the Old Syriac Version σάρξ is translated here by "body," *pagra*, not "*flesh*" (Burkitt, *Ev. Da-Meph.*, vol. ii. p. 306). See, however, footnote, p 290.

different meanings of the word "flesh" could be grouped under five heads. Of these the first and lowest, viz. = the "flesh" of animals used as food, never occurs in the New Testament.[1] And only once is σάρξ used also for the "flesh" of living creatures in the New Testament, viz. 1 Cor. xv. 39. The Book of Revelation alone, based as so much of its imagery is on Ezekiel, uses the word for human "flesh" regarded as food for vultures and beasts of prey (Rev. xvii. 16, xix. 18, 21; cf. Ezek. xxxii. 5, Dan. vii. 5. Observe the plural of σάρξ is used in this meaning). Jas. v. 3, is probably another instance of this usage.

In the classical[2] sense of σάρξ, as meaning the bare, literal, external flesh of the human body, the few instances in the New Testament are almost entirely confined to the mention of circumcision (Rom. ii. 28; Eph. ii. 11; Col. ii. 13). In S. Luke xxiv. 39, "a spirit hath not *flesh* and bones, as ye behold Me having," the word is used of human flesh, but of that on which the profound resurrection change had passed.

Acts ii. 26, "moreover My *flesh* also shall dwell in hope"; and ii. 31, "nor did His *flesh* see corruption." Observe that S. Luke, who uses the most purely classical Greek of all the New Testament writers, only has σάρξ in the non-classical sense in a quotation from Isa. xl. 5 (Luke iii. 6).

Another instance of the strictly classical sense of σάρξ may be Jude 23, "the garment spotted by the flesh," if, as it is probable, there is a reference to the garment infected by leprosy, Lev. xiii. 47.

There are a few other cases in which σάρξ may seem to be used in the classical sense, 2 Cor. vii. 1; Gal. iv. 13; Heb. ix. 13; 1 Pet. iii. 18, 21; 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jude 8; but careful consideration will show that the word in these passages had a decided

[1] In the Synoptic Gospels as well as in Acts σ. stands chiefly for substance of bodily existence, Luke xxiv. 39; Acts ii. 26, 31; man and humanity, Matt. xix. 5–6; Mark x. 8; Matt. xxiv. 22; Mark xiii. 20; Luke iii. 6; Acts ii. 17; for the difference between God and man (not in the physical sense), Matt. xvi. 17; and in connection with this the wrong relationship of the σ. to the Divine principle of Life in the inwardness of man, Matt. xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 38.

[2] It is worthy of note that most modern scholars approach the study of New Testament Theology through the avenue of classical Greek, and naturally enough stumble at σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις when taken in the classical sense of the words. The Church uses the term solely in the sense of the Greek Bible of the Old and New Testaments, whether the phrase is *resurrectio carnis* in its Latin, or "resurrection of the flesh" in its English translation.

One of the best examples from the Old Testament of "flesh" used in the classical Greek sense occurs in Zech. xiv. 12—*their flesh shall consume away while they rest upon their feet.* LXX αἱ σάρκες.

Hebraic complexion, and that no classical writer would have used the word σάρξ in these connections, as may be seen when these texts are dealt with in order.

Once only in the New Testament is σάρξ used in the familiar Old Testament sense of "blood relations," Rom. xi. 14, "if by any means I may provoke to jealousy (them that are) my *flesh*."

The word occurs close on 130 times in the general sense of "humanity," "man in his aspect of frailty," "a human being as contrasted with God," "mankind apart from God":—

D 1. *Combined with* αἷμα, *the sense of limitation, of transitoriness, of mortality, is intensified.*

Matt. xvi. 17, "*flesh and blood* hath not revealed it unto thee." The expression "flesh and blood" is very common in Talmud and Midrash [1] for humanity as contrasted with God. See Allen's note Matt. *Internat. Crit. Com.* p. 176.

1 Cor. xv. 50, "*flesh and blood* cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," *i.e.* human nature under its earthly limitations and as it now is. A perishable nature cannot really take possession of an imperishable Kingdom. For that Kingdom an incorruptible body is necessary, and this "flesh and blood" cannot be. "By σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα [2] is meant our present mortal nature, not our evil propensities," Robertson and Plummer, 1 Cor. *Internat. Crit. Com.* p. 375. In fact, the corruptible must first undergo that change by which it becomes incorruptible, 1 Cor. xv. 42–4.

Gal. i. 16, "I conferred not with *flesh and blood*," *i.e.* not with mere men.

Eph. vi. 12, "our wrestling is not against *flesh and blood*," *i.e.* not against sheer, bare humanity, so weak and frail, as contrasted with the unseen spiritual powers spoken of.

Heb. ii. 14, "since then the children are sharers in *flesh and blood*," [3] *i.e.* in humanity, with the emphasis laid on its lowliest side. He, too, shared in human nature to the full; "its aspect of humiliation and transitoriness," Westcott, *Heb.* p. 52.

N.B.—The expression "flesh and blood" does not occur in the canonical books of the Old Testament. It is first found in the Hebrew and Greek of Ecclus. xiv. 18; compare xvii. 31.

[1] J. Lightfoot's note runs: *Infinita frequentia hanc formulam* (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα) *adhibent scriptores Judaici, eaque homines Deo opponunt* (*Hor. Heb. in Ev. Matt.* p. 197). Comp. for inst. Ber. 33*a*.

[2] Compare Edwards, 1 *Cor.* p. 449, "σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, that is human nature in its present material, mortal, corruptible state."

[3] Observe the Greek order here and in Eph. vi. 12 is "blood and flesh." Westcott thinks "blood" may come first as representing the vital principle in man (note on Eph. vi. 12). Compare Lev. xvii. 11, 14, "for the life of the *flesh* is in the blood."

D 2. *Contrasted with "spirit": sometimes meaning the Holy Spirit, sometimes the human spirit, as being or meant to be under the influence of the Holy Spirit.*

Matt. xxvi. 41, Mark xiv. 38, "the spirit indeed is willing but the *flesh* is weak." Here "the spirit" is the higher side, "the flesh" the lower side, of our complex nature. "They denote the two extremes of human nature, πνεῦμα being the highest word used to describe the spiritual part of man, and hence, where distinctions are made within the soul itself, being used to denote the higher part; and σάρξ being used to denote the animal nature with its passions, and hence everything that belongs to the lower nature, whether proceeding from the 'flesh' or not. The two terms cover much the same ground in this popular use as our terms *higher and lower nature*" (*Internat. Crit. Com.* Matt. p. 271).

John iii. 6, "That which is born of the *flesh* is *flesh;* and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Westcott seems to regard the contrast here also as being between the two sides of human nature. His note is: "The words describe the characteristic principles of two orders. They are not related to one another as evil and good; but as the two spheres of being, with which man is connected. By the 'spirit' our complex nature is united to heaven, by the 'flesh' to earth" (p. 50). But does "that which is born of the human spirit" yield a tolerable meaning? The Evangelist is speaking of "a man being born of Water and the Spirit," meaning the Holy Spirit, in the preceding verse. The transition to a birth from the human spirit, even if that had an intelligible meaning, is surely too abrupt. "Water does not rise above its source" is the argument. That which is born of mere human nature remains merely human. Birth from the Holy Spirit issues in spirit, *i.e.* in a stirring of spiritual life in the human spirit. The human spirit can alone be roused to new life by the action of the Holy Spirit. The new and heavenly birth is above and beyond mere human agency.[1]

See Plummer's note in Cambridge Greek Test. for Schools, S. John, p. 102.

John vi. 63, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the *flesh* profiteth nothing."[2] Does the "spirit" here mean the Holy

[1] See also Professor Burton's *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, p. 201, text and note, for a particularly valuable discussion of John iii. 6.

[2] The Old Syriac (about 200 A.D.) of this verse 63 is extremely interesting. S, one of the two principal MSS., reads: "*It is the spirit that quickeneth*"

Spirit, or the spirit of man? Westcott, as in iii. 6, seems to understand the human spirit. But can the human spirit be said to "quicken" or give life? Plummer takes a middle course: "The statement is quite general, affirming the superiority of what is unseen and eternal to what is seen and temporal, but with a reference to Himself," [1] quoting iii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 18, "the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal," and more relevantly 1 Cor. xv. 45, "The first Adam became a living soul; the last Adam became a life-giving Spirit."

And quite possibly the contrast is between Himself, the life-giving Spirit, and bare humanity, σάρξ by itself being commonly humanity. Notice that the "*My* flesh" of verses 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, has become "flesh" unfortified by "My," and no longer, therefore, denotes the Divine humanity, but bare human nature by itself and left to itself.

Rom. viii. 4, "in us who walk not after the *flesh*, but after the Spirit," *i.e.* not after the rule of weak, fallible humanity, but under the guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit.[2]

Rom. viii. 5, "For they that are after the *flesh* do mind the things of the *flesh*; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit," *i.e.* they that model themselves on mere unassisted humanity confine their thoughts to the things and interests of the earthly life, whilst they that submit to the influence and

(Mrs. Lewis' rendering, but the indications of gender seem to require: "*He, i.e.* the Son of man of the preceding verse," *He is the spirit that quickeneth* the body), "but ye say the body profiteth nothing." C, the other principal MS., has: "That which quickeneth is spirit, otherwise body profiteth nothing." This has been pointed out by the Rev. H. Danby. Burkitt's note, *Ev. Da-Meph.*, vol. ii. p. 314, is less helpful than usual.

It is worthy of note that the Syriac word for σάρξ used throughout S. John vi., both in the Old Version and in the Peshitta, is *pagra*, the word that in the Old Testament represents the cognate Hebrew word for "a carcase," "a corpse," as *e.g.* Gen. xv. 11; 1 Sam. xxxi. 12. In the New Testament, however, *pagra* has a wider signification. Whilst it is used for "carcase" in Matt. xxiv. 28, in Matt. vi. 22, 2 Cor. xii. 3, it="living body," and in Rom. xii. 5 it stands for the mystical body of Christ. So that we need not be surprised to find it used of the eucharistical Body in S. John vi. The Old Syriac, as already noted, has *pagra* even in S. John i. 14, but the Peshitta is careful to use *besra* there, the cognate word of the Hebrew בָּשָׂר which the Greek Bible translates σάρξ in all its higher meanings.

[1] S. Athanasius clearly understood it thus: "He used both terms, spirit and flesh, of Himself," *Ep.* 4, *ad Serap.* 19. This section of the etter should be read in full.

[2] The notes of Sanday and Headlam in *Internat. Crit. Com.* on the whole passage, viii. 1–17, are extremely valuable. Liddon, too, is full and suggestive.

guidance of the Holy Spirit, find their thoughts insensibly lifted up and fixed on spiritual things.[1]

Rom. viii. 6, "For the mind of the *flesh*[2] is death; but the mind of the Spirit is life and peace," *i.e.* the surrender of our thoughts and acts to the sway of frail, fallible humanity issues in moral and spiritual death; the submission of mind, will, affection, and all our activities to the guidance of the Holy Spirit brings life and peace.

Rom. viii. 7, 8, "because the mind of the *flesh* is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be; and they that are in the *flesh* cannot please God," *i.e.* minding the impulses, the tendencies, the promptings of unregenerate humanity means denial of and hostility to the claims of God. Such blind or shortsighted limitation of our possibilities shows not only complete present disregard of God's law, but cuts off the possibility of obedience, so long as that course is persisted in.

Rom. viii. 9, "But ye are not in the *flesh*, but in the Spirit,[3] if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you," *i.e.* ye Christian folk are neither treading the dull round nor breathing the close atmosphere of a human life concerned only with this world's ambitions and hopes. You have opened windows towards a wider horizon and the sunshine and warmth of the Spirit enfold and invigorate you, since it is the blessed fact that God's Spirit makes His home within you.

Rom. viii. 12, 13, "we are debtors, not to the *flesh*, to live after the *flesh*:[4] for if ye live after the *flesh*, ye must die; but if by the Spirit ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live," *i.e.* you have obligations indeed to your human nature to make the best of it, but this does not mean that you must follow its

[1] We should be on our guard against confining "after the flesh," "the things of the flesh," to "the gratifications of sense," as Sanday and Headlam inadvertently do. The words cover the mind, will, affections, when these are concerned only with the affairs of human life on earth, and do not look upward and beyond. It is altogether a mistake to apply the words exclusively or even specially to what are commonly spoken of as sins of the flesh. They include these, but far more subtle and more dangerous are the earthbound mental and spiritual outlook denoted by the phrases.

[2] Sanday and Headlam's note: "Here, as elsewhere in these chapters, σάρξ is that side of human nature on which it is morally weak, the side on which man's physical organism leads him into sin." It would be truer to say that σάρξ here includes the whole of human nature, with the emphasis, however, on that weaker side, as is shown by the Apostle's passing naturally to the expression σῶμα (body) in verse 10.

[3] = in the *power* of the flesh, in the *power* of the Spirit.

[4] "To live after the flesh" is identified with the "deeds of the body."

unenlightened dictates, devoid of vision as it is, when it is left to itself; for if you pursue that course, there is only one end, and that is moral and spiritual death, in addition to that physical death which comes to all alike. Here is the test. Keep the appetites and propensities of the body, that weaker constituent of our complex human nature, under firm control, so that all inclination to disorderliness and excess may become extinct: all tendency to intemperance in eating and drinking, to sloth, to unchastity, to frivolity. If under the good guidance of the Spirit [1] you succeed in this side of self-discipline, the rest will follow. You are in the way of life, and the issue is sure.

1 Cor. v. 5, "to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the *flesh*, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." Here we have one of the few cases in which "flesh" and "spirit" denote the two constituents of human nature in contrast. The other clear instances are S. Matt. xxvi. 41, and 2 Cor. vii. 1. See notes on these.

2 Cor. vii. 1, "let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of *flesh* and spirit," *i.e.* of both our lower and higher nature. Here *flesh* is not inclusive of the whole nature as it commonly is. "The two together sum up human nature and the intercommunion of the parts is so close, that when either is soiled, the whole is soiled," 2 Cor. *Internat. Crit. Com.* p. 211.

Gal. iii. 3, "having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected in the *flesh?*" Note that here, as usually, the antithesis is between the Holy Spirit and σάρξ, the latter term being used in its widest signification, stark human nature and all that appeals to it, especially external ordinances and observances, as if these had an efficacy in themselves, apart from what they represent and convey.

Gal. iv. 29, "But as then he that was born after the *flesh* persecuted him that was born after the Spirit." Taken in connection with verse 23, "The son by the handmaid is born after the *flesh*, but the son by the freewoman is born through promise," the meaning is clear. "After the *flesh*" means in the ordinary course of human nature. Though Isaac's birth, too, was purely human in one sense, it was brought about by a higher law coming to the aid of the impotent ordinary law of humanity. It was

[1] Sanday and Headlam take "spirit" here to mean the human spirit, but the human spirit in direct contact with the Divine. That may be so, as the contrast is not with σάρξ but with σῶμα (body), which is only one element of σάρξ. But on the whole it seems simpler and more forcible to understand it of the Holy Spirit as in verses 5–9.

in fulfilment of promise and through a fresh energy of the Spirit, Who is Giver of life.

Gal. v. 16, 17, "Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the *flesh*. For the *flesh* lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the *flesh*"; and v. 19, "the works of the *flesh* are manifest." Clearly here "flesh" means the whole of human nature, not the lower self merely. Lightfoot's note points this out. "Observe the works of the *flesh*: of the fifteen or sixteen enumerated only the first three and the last two are of the *flesh* as ordinarily understood, the others are mental or spiritual, taking their rise in the human πνεῦμα."

Gal. vi. 8, "For he that soweth unto his own *flesh* shall of the *flesh* reap corruption; but he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life," *i.e.* he that restricts his thoughts, motives, and activities to this present, perishing human life will from that limited human life gather a harvest of decay, decay of all the powers and possibilities of expansion that belong to humanity when developed along the lines of its higher side.

1 Pet. iv. 6, iii. 18, "being put to death in the *flesh*, but quickened in the spirit." It is not clear that we have here a contrast between the lower and higher sides of His Human Nature.[1] The death on the Cross affected both, in that the Body and Soul were parted for a time, but the Soul or Spirit, endued with a fresh access of life, carried on Its activities in the spirit world. Though He submitted to the common lot so far as His full Humanity was concerned, His Spirit, instead of being hampered by separation from the Body, was stirred with a new vigour of life, and preached a mission to the waiting souls. Compare iv. 6.

1 Pet. iv. 6, "that they might be judged according to men in the *flesh*, but live according to God in the spirit." Once more "*flesh*" seems to have its usual meaning of human nature in its totality. In that nature they had died without having heard the Good News. Now it is preached to their spirits, that embracing its gracious promises they may have real life. Dr. Bigg's paraphrase runs: "that, after they had been judged like men in flesh (*i.e.* in their mortal nature), they might live like God in spirit" (*Internat. Crit. Com.* p. 170).

The contrast between "in the flesh" and "in the Lord" naturally has its place here.

[1] Dr. Bigg, however, in the *Internat. Crit. Com.*, sees an antithesis here between the Body and Spirit of the Lord. His useful note should be consulted, even if it does not carry complete conviction in this respect.

Philem. 16, "both in the *flesh* and in the Lord," *i.e.* both in ordinary human relationships, and in the new ties of religion. Lightfoot's note is: "In both spheres, in the affairs of this world and in the affairs of the higher" (Col. and Philem. p. 409).

D 3. *"Flesh" with or without the article as the subject or predicate of the sentence.*

Matt. xix. 6, Mark x. 8, "So that they are no more twain but one *flesh*." [1] The preceding sentence, "and the twain shall become one *flesh*," [1] is quoted also by S. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 16 and Eph. v. 31. "One flesh," *i.e.* one complete expression of humanity; the man by himself and the woman by herself being regarded from this point of view as incomplete.

Matt. xxiv. 22, Mark xiii. 20, "no *flesh* would have been saved," literally, "all *flesh* (=all mankind) would have failed to be saved." Dr. Bethune-Baker writes: "'Flesh' is the name by which mankind was commonly expressed in the Hebrew Scriptures, with particular reference to its weaker and more 'materialistic' constituents" (*Christian Doctrine*, p. 17, note 1).

Luke iii. 6, "And all *flesh* shall see the salvation of God," *i.e.* all men, the whole of humanity. Plummer's note on this verse is very clear: "All *flesh*—everywhere in the New Testament this expression seems to refer to the human race only; so even Matt. xxiv. 22; Mark xiii. 20; compare Acts ii. 17; Rom. iii. 20; 1 Pet. i. 24. Fallen man, man in his frailty and need of help, is meant" (*Internat. Crit. Com.* Luke, p. 87).

John i. 14, "And the WORD became FLESH." The great central text of the Incarnation, where "flesh" obviously has its full scriptural meaning.[2] The moulding of the term for some centuries, so that it could express full and complete humanity, is one of the marks of the providential guidance of events, which we speak of as the *præparatio evangelica*.

John vi. 51, "yea, and the bread which I will give is My *flesh*, for the life of the world"; vi. 55, "For my *flesh* is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed." The other verses, though the grammatical construction is different, are better taken together: vi. 52, "How can this man give us His *flesh* to eat?"

[1] The slight verbal differences do not affect the general meaning.

[2] Westcott's note, *The Gospel according to S. John*, p. 11, is as follows: "*Flesh*"—Humanity from the side of its weakness and dependence and mortality is naturally described as "flesh." In this respect "flesh" expresses here human nature as a whole, regarded under the aspects of its corporeal embodiment, including of necessity the "soul" (xii. 27), and the "spirit" (xi. 33; xiii. 21; xix. 30), as belonging to the totality of man. (Compare Heb. ii. 14.)

vi. 53, "Except ye eat the *flesh* of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves"; vi. 54, "He that eateth My *flesh* and drinketh My blood hath eternal life." Westcott's note on "My flesh" in verse 51 cannot be bettered: "*Flesh* describes human nature in its totality regarded from its earthly side. See also i. 13; iii. 6; viii. 15; xvii. 2; 1 John ii. 16; iv. 2; 2 John 7; Rom. viii. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. v. 7. The thought of death lies already in the word, but that thought is not yet brought out, as afterwards, by the addition of *blood* (in verses 53, 54, 55, 56). Compare Eph. ii. 14; Col. i. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 18." His note on verse 53, where "My flesh" and "My blood" are first mentioned separately, says: "The '*flesh*' is presented in its twofold aspect as '*flesh*' and 'blood,' and by this separation of its parts the idea of a violent death is presupposed. Further, 'the *flesh*' and 'the blood' 'of the Son of man,' by which title the representative character of Christ is marked in regard to that humanity which He imparts to the believer." On verse 55 Westcott's comment is: "*My flesh is true* (ἀληθής, real) *meat.* It stands in the same relation to man's whole being, as food does to his physical being. It must first be taken, and then it must be assimilated." Regarding the words of verse 57, "he that eateth Me," Westcott writes: "In this phrase we reach the climax of the revelation. The words *eat of the bread* (verses 50, 51), *eat the* flesh *of the Son of man* (verse 53) rise at last to the thought of *eating Christ.* The appropriation of the food which Christ gives, of the humanity in which He lived and died, issues in the appropriation of Himself."

These excerpts from pages 106–109 of the great scholar's Commentary on S. John are given to illustrate his teaching on the meaning of the word "flesh" in the New Testament in general and in this passage particularly. Plummer's notes on these verses in Cambridge Greek Testament are second in value only to those of Westcott himself.

Rom. iii. 20, and Gal. ii. 16, "by the works of the law shall no *flesh* be justified in His sight," a quotation from Ps. cxliii. 2. Sanday and Headlam's comment is: "πᾶσα σάρξ: man in his weakness and frailty" (Romans in *Internat. Crit. Com.* p. 81).

1 Cor. i. 29, "that no *flesh* should glory before God," more literally, "that *all flesh* should be precluded from glorying." Robertson and Plummer in *Internat. Crit. Com.*: "πᾶσα σάρξ is a well-known Hebraism (Acts ii. 17), meaning here the human race apart from the Spirit, *that all mankind should abstain from glorying before God*" (p. 26).

2 Cor. vii. 5, " our *flesh* had no relief." S. Paul uses the word *flesh* here in its usual scriptural sense of his entire humanity, body, mind, spirit, as the context shows. It is only some commentators, who are classical Greek scholars first and students of the New Testament second, who understand it in the narrow classical sense of the human flesh, the external covering of the human skeleton. It is never used in classical writers for other than human flesh and never as carrying an ethical signification,[1] as it does in the Old and New Testaments.

1 Pet. i. 24, " All *flesh* is as grass " is quoted from Isa. xl. 6, and=" all mankind is as grass."

D 4. For convenience' sake the rest of the texts in which the word " flesh " occurs are grouped into lists where the word is governed by certain prepositions, and into lists of the genitive, dative, and accusative cases, sometimes with and sometimes without the article in the Greek, though in most of the texts the English idiom requires the article even when it is omitted in the Greek. In a few of the passages dealt with above, some of these constructions have occurred already, where other features are more prominent, and thus led to their treatment under a different heading, *e.g.* Rom. viii. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, which could more conveniently be considered together.

Κατά with the accusative " according to," " on the level of " the flesh, " as far as human nature is concerned." [2]

John viii. 15, " ye judge after the *flesh*," *i.e.* according to merely human standards. Westcott : " They were content to form their conclusions on an imperfect, external, superficial examination." [3]

Rom. i. 3, " born of the seed of David according to the *flesh*," *i.e.* according to His Humanity, as far as His Human Nature is concerned. Sanday and Headlam paraphrase : " by physical

[1] The earliest writer, other than Jewish and Christian authors who were familiar with Scripture usage, to apply an ethical signification to the word σάρξ, is generally considered to be Plutarch. He wrote in the latter half of the first and in the two earlier decades of the second century A.D. But Professor Burton, *Spirit, Soul and Flesh*, p. 136, denies that Plutarch used σάρξ in an ethical sense.

[2] Robertson's *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, pp. 605–609, has some useful observations on κατά.

Observe the phrase κατὰ σάρκα is confined to the Pauline Epistles with the single exception of John viii. 15.

[3] There seems no adequate reason for the great scholar to limit σάρξ here to " that part of our nature which deals with appearances." In 2 Cor. v. 16, which he quotes as a parallel, " even though we have known Christ after the *flesh*," it must mean the full Humanity, and not only the lower side of it.

descent, tracing His lineage from David" (*Internat. Crit. Com.* p. 1).

Rom. iv. 1, "Abraham, our forefather according to the *flesh*." Similarly this refers to ordinary human descent. There is no contrast between the higher and lower self.

Rom. ix. 3, "My kinsmen according to the *flesh*." "My kinsmen as far as earthly relationship is concerned" (Sanday and Headlam, p. 225).

Rom. ix. 5, "of whom is Christ as concerning the *flesh*," "as regards His natural descent"; "on His human side" (Sanday and Headlam, pp. 225 and 232).

1 Cor. i. 26, "not many wise after the *flesh*," *i.e.* not many of the Corinthians were wise, or mighty, or noble in their purely human setting—in position, in public estimation, in learning, in culture.

1 Cor. x. 18, "Behold Israel after the *flesh*": "Look at Israel 'after the flesh,' the actual Israel of history" (Plummer, *Internat. Crit. Com.* p. 215). Israel by lineage.

2 Cor. i. 17, "or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the *flesh?*" *i.e.* according to the impulses of my own unenlightened human nature. Clearly Dr. Plummer (*Internat. Crit. Com.*) is not justified in confining the meaning of σάρκα to "the fitful fancies of my lower nature." The antithesis lies between unaided human nature and human nature raised to a higher power in those who have "the earnest of the Spirit" in their hearts (verse 22).

2 Cor. v. 16, "we henceforth know no man after the *flesh*: even though we have known Christ after the *flesh*, yet now we know Him so no more." "Knowing after the *flesh*" connotes acquaintance under purely human conditions, as one man knows another in the ordinary intercourse of human life. Plummer paraphrases the first part of the sentence: "we value no one because of his external attributes," which conveys a portion but hardly the whole of the meaning.

2 Cor. x. 2–4, "as if we walked according to the *flesh*. For though we walk in the *flesh*, we do not war according to the *flesh* (for the weapons of our warfare are not *of the flesh*)." The following verses show clearly that S. Paul is not speaking here of the lower side of human nature abstracted from the other constituents of humanity. He is dealing with the highest efforts of that nature, left to itself, unguided, having "imaginations," "thoughts," "every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God." Plummer paraphrases "walking after the *flesh*" here excellently: "as if our conduct were guided by carnal

principles," if "carnal" is taken not in the narrow sense, but as broadly human, limited to an horizon which shuts off all vision beyond this life. "Walking *in* the *flesh*," *i.e.* subject to all the limitations and drawbacks of human existence from which not even the regenerate and Spirit-guided are free on earth.

2 Cor. xi. 18, "Seeing that many glory after the *flesh*, I will glory also," *i.e.* since many boast of things which confer earthly distinction on a man, S. Paul will show that even from that low, worldly point of view he has no reason to fear comparison with his opponents—pride of birth, pride of office, pride of toils and sufferings, pride of high spiritual experiences. And he ends by declaring that his gladdest boast is in his weakness, that the strength of Christ may rest upon him, for it is when he is weak, that he is truly strong. "After the flesh," then, here means according to the merely human point of view.

Eph. vi. 5 (cf. Col. iii. 22), "be obedient unto them that according to the *flesh* are your masters." Dr. Moule, *Ephesian Studies*, p. 313, "obey your fleshward lords." Obey those who are your masters as far as purely human, earthly relations are concerned. Obviously S. Paul has the whole sweep of human life and activity in view, and is not speaking of the fleshly side of human nature as commonly understood.

D 5. Ἐν *with the dative, sometimes with and sometimes without the article.*

This construction, "in *flesh*," "in the flesh," is exclusively Pauline, and is balanced by "in Christ," an expression also peculiar to S. Paul, except that it is copied in 1 Pet. iii. 16, v. 10, 14, and 1 John v. 20.

Rom. vii. 5, "when we were in the *flesh*," *i.e.* before our conversion, when we were confined to the narrow circle of purely human views, aims, aspirations, and motives. Sanday and Headlam have a particularly valuable note here: "Although σάρξ is human nature, especially on the side of its frailty, it does not follow that there is any dualism in S. Paul's conception, or that he regards the body as inherently sinful. Indeed, this very passage proves the contrary. It implies that it is possible to be 'in the body' without being 'in the flesh.' The body, as such, is plastic to influences of either kind: it may be worked upon by Sin through the senses, or it may be worked upon by the Spirit. In either case the motive-force comes from without. The body itself is neutral. See Gifford, pp. 48–52."

Rom. vii. 18, "in me, that is, in my *flesh*, dwelleth no good thing." Here "flesh" is expressly placed in apposition to

" me," S. Paul's own complete personal self, and can only mean his whole humanity, body and soul, one complex entity.

Rom. viii. 3, " For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the *flesh*, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful *flesh*, . . . condemned sin in the *flesh*," *i.e.* what the Law could not effect, God effected. The Law's inability arose from the weakness consequent on the frailty of our human nature. But God sent His own Son in the likeness of that sinful humanity, " like," since His was true humanity, but only " like," since it was not sinful. In that human nature, which he had assumed, Christ died on the Cross, and for ever condemned sin in a way that mere law could never have done. Throughout this chapter " *flesh* " emphatically means the whole human nature.[1]

2 Cor. iv. 11, " that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal *flesh*." Here we have the idea of " mortality," which is implicit in the word " flesh," when used as a synonym for humanity, expressly brought out by the adjective " mortal." It has not been felt to be necessary by the Apostle anywhere else in his extant writings.

Gal. ii. 20, " and that life which I now live in the *flesh* I live in faith," *i.e.* that human life of mine, limited though it be in span and scope by the laws of its nature, is lived in the atmosphere and energy of faith. To make " *flesh* " here=the lower side of our nature would be to cramp the whole thought of the Apostle unduly.

Gal. vi. 12, 13, " As many as desire to make a fair show in the *flesh*,[2] they compel you to be circumcised . . . they desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your *flesh*." " A fair show in the *flesh*," *i.e.* in external rites ; " make a pretentious display of their religion in outward ordinances " (Lightfoot). " Glory in your *flesh*," *i.e.* that they may boast of your submission to this carnal rite. We saw above that " flesh " has the nearest approach in the New Testament to the classical Greek sense, when it is used in connection with circumcision. But here, even in this connection, it has a more extended sense. Emmet comments excellently on " a fair show in the flesh," " not literally, but in outward and worldly things " (*Reader's Commentary*, Gal. p. 62).

Eph. ii. 11, " ye, the Gentiles in the flesh . . . circumcision,

[1] See above comment on verses 4–13. Sanday and Headlam on the whole of the chapter should be read without fail.

[2] Dative without *ἐν*.

in the *flesh*, made by hands." In this verse "flesh" seems first to be used in its full usual meaning: "You who are Gentiles in nature"; the mention of literal circumcision seems to point to the second "*flesh*" as meaning external human flesh in the narrow classical sense of the word.

Eph. ii. 15, "having abolished in His *flesh* the enmity, . . ." *i.e.* in His full complete Human Nature on the Cross. Dr. Armitage Robinson's admirable note is given at length: "'His flesh' is the scriptural term for what we speak of as His humanity, His human nature. 'He took upon Him flesh' was an early Christian mode of speaking of the mystery of the Incarnation. It is the same in meaning with the great phrase of the Te Deum, *Tu ad liberandum suscepisti hominem:* 'Thou tookest upon Thee man, to deliver him.' The flesh of Christ is our common humanity, which He deigned to make His own. So that in Him 'all flesh,' that is, all humanity, finds its meeting point" (Eph. pp. 63–4).

Phil. i. 22, "But if to live in the *flesh*." Dr. Moule: "'If living on in the flesh be my lot,' *i.e.* living on amid the limitations, failures, weaknesses of mortal man" (*Philippian Studies*, p. 66).

Phil. i. 24, "yet to abide in the *flesh* is more needful for your sake." Dr. Moule paraphrases very aptly thus: "Then *the abiding by the flesh*, the brave faithful holding fast to the conditions of earthly trial" (p. 66).

Phil. iii. 3, 4, ". . . and have no confidence in the *flesh:* though I myself might have confidence even in the *flesh:* if any other man thinketh to have confidence in the *flesh*, I yet more." "Confidence in the *flesh*," *i.e.* trusting in the privileges of human descent. As the context shows, "flesh" in this passage cannot be confined to the lower side of our nature. It has nothing to do with the merely physical. Dr. Moule's note on iii. 3 is most useful: "The σάρξ in S. Paul is very fairly represented by the word "self" as used popularly in religious language. It is man taken as apart from God, and so man *versus* God; then by transition it may mean, as here, the products of such a source, the labours of the self-life to construct a self-righteousness. It is hardly necessary to say that, in such contexts as this, where it stands more or less distinguished from the πνεῦμα, it is not a synonym for the "body." Sins of "the flesh" may be sins purely of the mind, as, *e.g.* "emulation" (Gal. v. 20) (*Philippian Studies*, p. 161, n.).

Col. i. 24, "fill up on my part that which is lacking of the

afflictions of Christ in my *flesh*, for His body's sake." "In my *flesh*," in the totality of my nature, in mind as well as in body. Dr. Moule: "In the willing use of my human faculties and energies" (*Colossian Studies*, p. 100).

Col. ii. 1, "for as many as have not seen my face in the *flesh*," *i.e.* my face in my proper human person.

1 Tim. iii. 16, "He who was manifested in the *flesh*," *i.e.* in complete humanity, body, soul and spirit. Compare 1 John iv. 2; 2 John 7.

1 Pet. iv. 1, 2, "Forasmuch then as Christ suffered in the flesh,[1] . . . for he that hath suffered in the *flesh* hath ceased from sin; that ye no longer should live the rest of your life in the *flesh* to the lusts of men, but . . ." Just as the suffering of Christ in the *flesh* was in the fulness of His Human Nature, so the word used twice here of the Christian comprises the whole of that humanity, in which he spends his life on earth and endures his sufferings.

1 John iv. 2, "every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God."

2 John 7, "they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the *flesh*." There could be no more striking examples of the common New Testament use of "flesh" to denote the whole complex of human nature. The meaning of the writer turns on the reality and completeness of the Incarnation. And it is particularly worthy of notice, that if "coming" in 2 John 7 is taken in its usual future sense and speaks of the Second Coming (see Brooke, *Internat. Crit. Com.* Joh. Epp. p. 175), the risen, ascended, and glorified humanity of our Lord, in which He is to come to judge the quick and the dead, is spoken of under the term "flesh." And even if "coming" is regarded "as expressing the eternal, timeless coming of the Incarnate One, a continuous, abiding fact," that coming includes the present coming in the Eucharist and otherwise, as well as at the Second Advent itself. So in whichever of its possible senses "coming" in 2 John 7 is understood, "*flesh*" is seen to be a proper scriptural word to apply to the Humanity of our Lord as it exists now in the super-sensual world. Hence by analogy it is a fitting word to use of our own humanity at the resurrection, when our bodies of humiliation shall have been fashioned anew and conformed to the Body of His glory (Phil. iii. 21). Consequently the traditional expression of our future hope—"I

[1] Dative without ἐν, but the slight shade of difference in meaning cannot be conveyed in a translation.

believe in the resurrection of the *flesh*"—is vindicated and justified by this language of Scripture.

The only remaining occurrence of a preposition with σάρξ is ἐπί with the accusative in :—

Acts ii. 17, "I will pour forth of My Spirit upon all *flesh*," a quotation from Joel ii. 28 (iii. 1, LXX). "All flesh"=all mankind, as usual.

D 6. *The genitive σαρκός dependent on another substantive, sometimes with and sometimes without the article.*

John i. 13, "which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the *flesh*, nor of the will of man, but of God." The spiritual sonship of the children of God is ascribed to a direct act of God. Natural fatherhood is excluded by a threefold, ascending denial: "not of blood," the physical agent; "nor of the will of the *flesh*," *i.e.* human nature (with emphasis on the lower side of that nature); "nor of the will of man" (note ἀνδρός, the higher, nobler word for man, betokening that the emphasis is on the higher side of his nature). See Westcott's notes on the passage, and particularly Plummer's in the Cambridge Gk. Test. for Schools.[1]

John xvii. 2, "even as Thou gavest Him authority over all *flesh*," the familiar expression for the whole human race.

Rom. vi. 19, "because of the infirmity of your *flesh*," *i.e.* on account of the weakness of that frail nature of yours.

Rom. ix. 8, "It is not the children of the *flesh* that are children of God," *i.e.* it is not birth in the ordinary course of nature that confers the filial relationship towards God in the full Christian sense of sonship. That is a further bestowal of His bounty.

Rom. xiii. 14, "make not provision for the *flesh*, to fulfil the lusts thereof." S. Paul's list of the works of the *flesh* (Gal. v. 19–21), shows that he includes the faults and failings of every department of our fallen nature in the "lusts of the flesh." It is a very grave mistake to lay special emphasis on what are commonly spoken of as "fleshly lusts." Sanday and Headlam see here rightly "the contrast between the old nature, the flesh of sin, and the new, the life in Christ" (*Internat. Crit. Com.* Rom. p. 379).

Gal. iv. 13, "ye know that because of an infirmity of the

[1] There is more force in Dr. Allen's argument by analogy from this passage (*Interpreter* Oct. 1905), for the Virgin Birth of our Lord than Dr. Bethune-Baker will allow (*Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, p. 109). Tertullian, *De Carne Christi*, c. 19, understands the text as referring to our Lord's own Birth.

flesh I preached the Gospel unto you the first time," "flesh" closely approaching here the meaning of "body." But if Ramsay be right, as he most probably is, in supposing that the sickness, which detained S. Paul amongst the Galatians on this occasion, was the endemic malaria of the district, that disabling fever attacks the mind as much as the body. It lays the whole human constitution low, as every one who has suffered from it knows to his cost. In any case, there is no absolute need to understand "flesh" in this verse as meaning the body only. And the same may be said of the word in the following verse, iv. 14, "your temptation which was in my *flesh*," or, as the R.V. has it, "that which was a temptation to you in my *flesh* ye despised not," *i.e.* in my poor, feeble, racked nature, on its side of weakness and mortality.

Eph. ii. 3, "among whom we also all once lived in the lusts of our *flesh*, doing the desires of the *flesh* and of the mind." See note on Rom. xiii. 14. Dr. Moule comments thus: "*The desires of our flesh*, the bias and preferences of the self-life, whatever form they took; *doing the willings of the flesh and of the thoughts*, the volitions of the fallen self, whether coming out in concrete action or lurking in unholy imaginations" (*Ephesian Studies*, pp. 72–3).

Col. i. 22, "And you . . . hath He reconciled in the body of His *flesh* through death," *i.e.* the body of His humanity. This is one of the few instances in which emphasis is laid in the New Testament on the bodily sufferings of Christ upon the Cross. To bring out this side of the truth, S. Paul is obliged to add the word "body" to the commoner word "flesh." The word translated "flesh" in the Old Testament denotes the whole nature of man (see Appendix A). The Greeks felt and expressed a sharp antithesis between body and soul. The LXX introduces the word "body" (σῶμα) a few times in the Pentateuch, *e.g.* Lev. xv. 2, and a fair number of times in the other books, but never as implying a contrast between soul and body. They might have used σάρξ in the strict classical sense of the external flesh of the human frame, but that word had been used by them in the wider, extended sense to express not a part of humanity but the whole. S. Paul, familiar with that developed use of "flesh," feels constrained to say "*body* of His flesh," when the physical side of the Passion is to be expressed emphatically.[1]

[1] The expression "the body of the flesh" occurs in Sir. xxiii. 16, and Enoch xv. 9 (as quoted by Syncellus), where Professor Burton takes it to be a pleonasm for "the body" (*Spirit, Soul, and Flesh*, p. 151).

Col. ii. 11, "in the putting off of the body of the *flesh*," *i.e.* in divesting yourselves mystically of that body which was the appanage of your unregenerate humanity. S. Paul, as in Rom. vi. 4–6, regards Baptism as a sharing in Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection. As the Body of the Lord rose again a new Body, spiritual, freed from the clogging laws of sense, so the body of the baptized is potentially a new body, no longer the slave of the lower impulses, but quickened to a new life, nourished by the Body of the Lord, in process of becoming that "spiritual body," which shall in due time be a fitting instrument for the energies and activities of the perfected soul. The business of the Christian life is to turn the potential into the actual. The mystic death, burial, and resurrection are to become facts of experience, by virtue of the vital powers then bestowed, and continually renewed in response to living faith in the living Lord. Dr. Moule's note on "body" in ii. 11 is good: "σῶμα with S. Paul appears always to mean the physical frame, though with a deep side-reference to its connection with temptation and sin" (*Col. Stud.* p. 151).[1]

Col. ii. 18, "vainly puffed up by his *fleshly* mind." Lightfoot, p. 264, gives the meaning neatly: "the mind of his flesh, *i.e.* unenlightened by the Spirit; compare Rom. viii. 7." "Flesh"=unaided humanity.

Col. ii. 23, "not of any value against the indulgence of the *flesh*," *i.e.* against the gratification of the impulses and desires of our nature, so feeble and wayward when left to itself.

Heb. v. 7, "Who in the days of His *flesh*," *i.e.* in the days of His Incarnate Life on earth. Wickham: "during His bodily life on earth." So 1 Pet. iv. 2, "your time in the flesh" (*Westminster. Com. Heb.* p. 35). Westcott: "'Flesh' here describes, not that which is essential to true humanity, but the general conditions of humanity in the present life: Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 22, 24; 1 Pet. 4, 2" (*Heb.* p. 125).

Heb. ix. 10, "*carnal* ordinances," *i.e.* ordinances capable of touching human nature only externally. Compare vii. 16, "after the law of a carnal commandment," where the adjective is used, not the substantive as here, but the meaning is the same. Wickham's note (*Heb.* p. 66), and Westcott's (p. 254), should be consulted.

[1] Lightfoot's treatment of "the putting off of the body of the *flesh*" is disappointingly meagre (*Col.* p. 250). His taking "body of the flesh" to mean "body which consists of the flesh" can hardly be right. "Of the flesh" is the ordinary possessive genitive: "the body which belongs to the *flesh*," *i.e.* to humanity.

Heb. ix. 13, "sanctify unto the cleanness of the *flesh*," *i.e.* conveying only external and ritual purification of our nature.

Heb. x. 20, "a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, His *flesh*," *i.e.* entrance into the sanctuary is provided by a new road of access, through His Humanity, which at once veils His Godhead and is our means of approach to God.

Heb. xii. 9, "we had the fathers of our *flesh* to chasten us," *i.e.* our human fathers, the fathers from whom we derived our humanity.

1 Pet. iii. 21, "not the putting away of the filth of the *flesh*." The washing of Baptism is not a mere external cleansing, similar to the ritual purifications of the old Law; it is not a mere putting away of our exterior nature's uncleanness.

2 Pet. ii. 10, "but chiefly them that walk after the *flesh* in the lust of defilement." "*Walk after* the flesh" is a Hebraism (comp. Deut. vi. 14)—living according to the dictates of undisciplined and unchastened human nature. Comp. Jude 7, 16, and Old Testament generally for "walk" in this sense. Bigg, *Internat. Crit. Com.*, has a useful note here.

2 Pet. ii. 18, "they entice in the lusts of the *flesh*." There is no reason for confining "lusts of the flesh" in this Epistle to carnal lusts so called. They include all the irregular cravings of our nature, whether mental or physical, when it lacks the grace and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

1 John ii. 16, "For all that is in the world, the lust of the *flesh*, and the lust of the eyes, and the vain glory of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away and the lusts thereof. . . ." Brooke, *Internat. Crit. Com.*, comments on "*flesh*" here: σάρξ denoted human nature as corrupted by sin. . . . There is no need to narrow down the meaning any further to special forms of desire. There is really nothing in the Epistle to suggest that the grosser forms of immorality were either practised or condoned by the false teachers. . . . All such desires and feelings are not part of that endowment of humanity which has come from the Father. They are a perversion of man's true nature as God made him. They have their origin in the finite order in so far as it has become estranged from God" (pp 48–9).

Jude 7, "having with these given themselves over to fornication, and gone after strange flesh." Note that "flesh" is used of the human form, in which the "angels" of Gen. xix. appeared to Lot and the people of Sodom. Not unlike this is the use of בָּשָׂר, usually translated "flesh," but in R.V. "body," of the

cherubim in Ezek. x. 12, where LXX omits the word altogether.[1]

D 7. *The dative case without ἐν.*

Rom. vii. 25, "So then I myself with the mind serve the law of God, but with the *flesh* the law of sin." "Mind" = the higher self, "flesh" = the lower self.

1 Cor. vii. 28, "Yet such shall have tribulation *in the flesh*," *i.e.* in the experiences of their human life.

2 Cor. xii. 7, "a thorn *in the flesh*," causing acute suffering throughout his whole being, not merely in his lower nature.

Gal. v. 13, "only use not your freedom for an occasion *to the flesh*," *i.e.* an occasion for our weak human nature to follow its own unregulated impulses.

Col. ii. 5, "For though I am absent *in the flesh*," *i.e.* absent in my proper, visible human personality.

D 8. *Accusative after transitive verb.*

Gal. v. 24, "They that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the *flesh*, with the passions and lusts thereof," *i.e.* have crucified all the irregular passions and desires which affect the mental, the emotional, and the physical constitution of the natural man.

Eph. v. 29, "he that loveth his wife loveth himself: for no man ever hated his own *flesh*." "Flesh" is given as a synonym for "himself,"[2] and therefore has its full meaning, viz. a man's whole nature in general, with a special eye to its weaker side, but not excluding the higher.

Jude 8, "these also in their dreamings defile the *flesh*." The above remarks apply to this verse also.

D 9. *For completeness the adjectives formed from σάρξ are included.* Σαρκικός occurs seven times in the Revisers' text, and σάρκινος four times, but the MSS. in several cases are divided in their readings. In strict classical Greek, the first is ethical = "carnal,"[3] "fleshly," the other is literal = "made of flesh."

[1] That is to say, in the common text. The *Codex Marchalianus*, however, has αἱ σάρκες (*Cambridge LXX*, vol. 3, p. 400), and so have Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

[2] S. Paul probably has Gen. ii. 23, 27, in mind ("flesh of my flesh," "they shall be *one* flesh").

[3] It is unfortunate that the word "carnal" and its derivatives have come down in the world in recent times. As may be seen in the *Oxford Dictionary*, these words were once coextensive in meaning with the Biblical σάρξ, now of a good, now of a middle, now of a bad, meaning. In fact, "carnality" is used in 1646 by Sir T. Browne to express our Lord's Humanity. But in ordinary use at present "carnal" has come to be not only equivalent to "sensual," but is even narrowed down to one type of sensuality, viz. impurity. It may be said with certainty that "carnal" never once has this debased meaning in the New Testament.

This holds good in such a text as 1 Cor. iii. 3, "for ye are yet *carnal:* for whereas there is among you jealousy and strife, are ye not *carnal* and walk after the manner of men?" [1] σαρκικοί, *i.e.* swayed by the sentiments, aims, prejudices of unenlightened humanity. In 2 Cor. iii. 3, "not in tables of stone, but in tables that are hearts of *flesh.*" Here, as in Ezek. xi. 19, and xxxvi. 26, "hearts of flesh," καρδίαι σάρκιναι, are = "human hearts," and are used in a good sense. The first occurs also in

Rom. xv. 27, "For if the Gentiles have been partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in *carnal things.*"

1 Cor. ix. 11, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your *carnal things?*" "Carnal" in these two passages also, though contrasted with "spiritual," bears a good meaning; carnal things are things connected with the ordinary wants of human life, but blameless.

2 Cor. i. 12, "not with *fleshly* wisdom, but in the grace of God, we behaved ourselves in the world," *i.e.* S. Paul did not take the wisdom of the mere natural man as his guide in life, but relied on the grace of God for leading.

1 Pet. ii. 11, "Beloved, I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims, to abstain from *fleshly* lusts which war against the soul," *i.e.* from the desires of undisciplined humanity, in whatever way they show themselves to the world without.[2]

Besides the verse 2 Cor. iii. 3, quoted above, there are two other instances of σάρκινος in S. Paul and one in Hebrews:—

Rom. vii. 14, "For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am *carnal,* sold under sin," *i.e.* in myself, and by myself I am but a mere natural man, weak, subject to temptation and even succumbing to it.

1 Cor. iii. 1, "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto *carnal,* as unto babes in Christ," *i.e.* not as unto men completely guided and controlled by the Holy Spirit, but as still too much under the influence of human desires and emotions, mere beginners in the School of Christ.

Heb. vii. 16, "after the likeness of Melchizedek there ariseth

"Fleshly" was also a word used in an inoffensive sense, but more quickly came to mean "unchaste," a meaning which, as a translation of σαρκικός (1 Pet. ii. 11; 2 Cor. i. 12), it is not intended to bear. Readers and hearers should be warned against importing the low, modern sense into these words in the New Testament.

[1] It seems that in Rom. vii. 14 the reading σαρκινός (=σάρξ) εἰμι is the original one.

[2] This is the only occurrence of σαρκικός in the New Testament outside the Pauline Epistles; σαρκικῆς is a variant, however, in Heb. vii. 16.

another priest, Who hath been made, not after the law of a *carnal* commandment, but after the power of an endless life." The Jewish priests were men necessarily of the tribe of Levi according to the flesh, by lineal descent. The Priest, Who was to supersede that priesthood, drew His title from the power of an endless life. Nairne finely says: "But the Psalmist's appeal will be abundantly justified if another priest shall really be found now rising like the sun upon the expectant world, whose characteristic is power to accomplish the need of men and the purpose of God—that power springing from an unfailing source of invincible life; all of which is in marked contrast with the mechanical ordering of the Levitical ministrations. The one belongs to the spiritual fount of life, the other to the fleeting fashions of the dying world" (*The Ep. of Priesthood*, pp. 349–350).[1]

N.B.—In the foregoing comments, attention has been given exclusively to the meaning of σάρξ. All other points, critical and exegetical, are purposely passed over.

[1] Nairne's impressive discussion of our Lord's Resurrection on pp 185–192 should be read without fail.

APPENDIX E

ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF THE GREEK WORDS FOR "RESURRECTION"—IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, MAINLY *ἀνάστασις, ἔγερσις*—AND THEIR VERBS

E 1. A PRELIMINARY word must be said about the use of these words in classical Greek. It can be stated confidently at once that the classical writers never used these words in the Christian sense of resurrection.[1] Ἀνάστασις and its verb occur a few times

[1] The classical writers mainly use *ἀνάστασις* and the corresponding verb in denials of the possibility of the soul's return to this earthly life after death. For example:—

Il. xxiv. 550–1, Achilles says to Priam about the dead Hector: "For thou wilt achieve nought by mourning for thy noble son, nor wilt thou raise him up" (*οὐδέ μιν ἀναστήσεις*); compare *Il.* ix. 408–9, "A man's soul cannot come back by robbery or any other means, when once it passes the fence of the teeth." Æschylus, *Agam.* 1360–1, makes a chorus leader remark, "I do not see how we can *raise the dead* with all our talk" (*τὸν θανόντ' ἀνιστάναι πάλιν*); and in *Eumen.* 599–600 (Davis' Text, Dub. Univ. Press), "But when the dust has sucked up a man's blood, dead once for all, there is *no raising up again*" (*οὔτις ἔστ' ἀνάστασις*); Sophocles, *El.* 137–9, "But never by laments or prayers *wilt thou raise up thy father* (*πατέρ' ἀνστάσεις*) from Hades' lake, which receives all alike"; Euripides protests against this in *Alcestis*, but the Chorus is pessimistic, 112–135, unless Æsclepius, son of Apollo, will intervene:—

> "Ah, once there was one:—
> Were life's light in the eyes
> Of Phœbus's son
> Then our darling *might rise*
> From the mansions of darkness, through the portals of
> Hades return to our skies.
>
> For he *raised up the dead*
> (*δμαθέντας γὰρ ἀνίστη*)
> Ere flashed from the heaven,
> From Zeus's hand sped,
> That bolt from the levin."
>
> (Way's translation, p. 8.)

At the beginning of the play we are told that Æsclepius had been slain by a thunderbolt for restoring Hippolytus to life; at the end Heracles performs the miracle and restores the dead wife to her husband's arms.

But the Greek imagination in its highest flights never once rose above restoration for a space to ordinary earthly life, in an ordinary earthly

in the sense of "reanimation," to "revivify." In these, instances they describe the temporary return of a departed soul to life, but to life in the same physical body and under the conditions of ordinary earthly life. This recalling of the soul for a time to inhabit the resuscitated body is similar in kind to the three revivals from the dead mentioned in the Old Testament (1 Kings xvii. 22; 2 Kings iv. 35; xiii. 21), and to the five of the New Testament (Mark v. 42; Luke vii. 15; John xi. 44; Acts ix. 40; xx. 10). The return of the soul to the old corruptible body, only in process of time to pay the deferred debt of nature, is altogether different in manner and kind from "the resurrection of the body" affirmed in the Creeds. The Christian belief is in the resurrection of the body that has become incorruptible, endued with the faculties and powers of an endless life, no longer subject to the laws of mortality and decay, fitted in all respects to the heavenly environment in which it will find itself.[1]

E 2. In the Old Testament ἀνάστασις occurs four times (Ps. lxv., title; Zech. iii. 8; Lam. iii. 33; Dan. xi. 20), but not in any sense of rising from the dead. The verb occurs some 450 times, always in a naturalistic sense. In 2 Maccabees (latter half of second century B.C.) we have both noun and verb for the first time in the full sense of resurrection from the dead: in vii. 9, the second martyr addresses his torturers, "Thou, miscreant, dost release us out of this present life, but the King of the world shall *raise us up*, who have died for His laws, *unto an eternal renewal of life*" (εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ἀναστήσει). In vii. 14, the fourth martyr exclaimed at the point of death: "It is good to die at the hands of men and look for the *hopes* which are given by God, that *we shall be raised up again by Him* (ἐλπίδας πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ); *for as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection unto life*" (σοὶ γὰρ ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν οὐκ ἔσται). The famous passage, xii. 43, 44, reads, "And when he had made a collection man by man, . . . he sent unto Jerusalem to offer a sacrifice for sin, doing therein right well and honourably, in that he took thought for *a resurrection* (ὑπὲρ ἀναστάσεως ἀναλογιζόμενος). For if he were not expecting that *they that had fallen would rise again* (τοὺς προπεπτωκότας ἀναστῆναι), it were superfluous and idle to pray for the dead."

body. It should be added that Dittenberger's whole five volumes of *Greek Monumental Inscriptions* do not contain a single example of ἀνάστασις or ἀνιστάναι even in this restricted sense, nor do the thirteen volumes of Oxyrhyncus, Fayûm and Hibeh papyri, published by the Egypt Exploration Fund, nor those of Tebtunis by the University of California.

[1] But see Isa. xxvi. 19.

E 3. In the three Old Testament narratives of restoring the dead to life, neither *ἀνάστασις* nor its verb is used to describe the event. 1 Kings xvii. 22, "And the Lord hearkened unto the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came unto him again, and *he revived*." The ordinary Greek text has "the child *cried out*" (*ἀνεβόησεν*), but the Alexandrine Codex reads: "and the soul of the child returned to his inwards, and he *lived*" (*ἔζησεν*). The raising of the Shunammite's son, 2 Kings iv. 35, has the same Hebrew word as is translated exactly by *ἔζησεν*="revived," but the LXX text is: "the child sneezed seven times and *opened his eyes*." 2 Kings xiii. 21 relates the revival of the dead man on touching Elisha's relics: "and as soon as the man touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood up on his feet" (*ἔζησεν καὶ ἀνέστη ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ*; observe *ἀνέστη* used purely naturalistically). Ezekiel's vision of the vitalising of the dry bones, xxxvii. 1–14, is shown by the paragraph which follows it to be a parable and prophecy of the revival of Israel's dead hopes and aspirations. But Gregory of Nyssa, following earlier Christian writers, sees in it also a foreshadowing of the general Resurrection.[1] So the word used for "they *lived* and stood up on their feet" should be noted. It is the same word in Hebrew and Greek as in 1 Kings xvii. 22, and in the other two passages. Note also that Heb. xi. 19, "accounting that God is able *to raise up* (*ἐγείρειν*) even from the dead" declares Abraham's faith that God could bring Isaac back to life to him again, when he should have offered up his son.

Once in S. Paul and once in Revelation the Old Testament word for "lived," "revived," is used of our Lord's Resurrection:[2] Rom. xiv. 9, "For to this end Christ died and *lived* (*ἔζησεν*) again, that He might be Lord both of the dead and of the living";[3] Rev. ii. 8, "These things saith the First and the Last, which was dead, and *lived again*"; compare i. 18. And in Rev. xx. 4, 5, it is used of the millennial resurrection: "and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, . . . and they *lived*, and reigned with Christ a thousand years. The rest of the dead *lived* not until the thousand years should be finished."

With these exceptions, *ἀνάστασις* and *ἀνιστάναι*, *ἐγείρειν*,

[1] *De An. et Resurr.*, Migne P. G. Tom. 46, p. 139 D.

[2] In Rabbinic Literature the Resurrection is invariably designated by: "the living (again) of the dead."

[3] Obviously S. Paul wished to balance his sentence by the same word in both clauses.

ἔγερσις (once only), are the words invariably used in the New Testament of our Lord's Resurrection and that of His people.

E 4. We have detailed accounts in the Gospels of the dead being brought back to life on three [1] occasions by our Lord, and in the Acts S. Peter raises Dorcas, and S. Paul Eutychus. Cf. Matt. xi. 5; Luke vii. 22, "... the dead are *raised up*" (*νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται*)—part of our Lord's reply to the Baptist's inquiries.

Jairus' Daughter.—Matt. ix. 25, "But when the crowd was put forth, He entered in and took her by the hand, and the damsel *arose*" (*ἠγέρθη*); Mark v. 41, "And taking the child by the hand, He saith unto her, *Talitha cumi*, which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, *Arise* (*ἔγειραι*). And straightway the damsel *rose up*" (*ἀνέστη*). Luke viii. 54, 55, "He, taking her by the hand, called, saying, Maiden, *arise* (*ἐγείρου*). And her spirit returned, and she *rose up* (*ἀνέστη*) immediately"; compare Mark ix. 26, 27, "and he became as one dead; insomuch that the most part said, He is dead. But Jesus took him by the hand and *raised him up, and he arose*" (*ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέστη*).

The Widow's Son.—Luke vii. 14, 15, "and He said, Young man, I say unto thee, *Arise* (*ἐγέρθητι*). And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak."

[1] For completeness sake, Herod's supposition that our Lord was John Baptist *risen again* from the dead should be mentioned:

Matt. xiv. 2, "This is John the Baptist; he is *risen from the dead*" (*αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν*).

Mark vi. 14, "John the Baptist is *risen from the dead*" (*ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν*).

Luke ix. 7, "John was *risen from the dead*" (*ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν*).

There is some confusion in the MSS. about the tenses of "is risen." The Revisers' text is followed here as throughout.

S. Matthew includes in the preliminary Apostolic Commission the command: "raise the dead" (*νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε*, x. 8). One wonders whether the pious folk who insist on the revival of the injunction "heal the sick" as a permanent endowment of the Apostolic Ministry, have noticed that "raise the dead, cleanse the lepers" forms part of the same commission, as recorded by S. Matthew. Were these powers in physical matters to be transmissible to the successors of the Apostles? The earliest Forms of Ordination that have come down to us, betray no consciousness that these powers were understood to be handed on. It shows a very poor conception of our Lord's promise, "greater works than these shall he that believeth on Me do" (John xiv. 12), to claim a portion of the lower bodily works. To heal sick souls, to raise to a new life men dead in trespasses and sins, to cleanse the spiritually leprous is incomparably a greater work than to confer a temporary earthly benefit. This is the high function of the Apostolic Ministry. Beyond question God may and does bestow on whom He wills "gifts of healings." The sacramental Ordinance of the Unction of the Sick has primarily a spiritual object in view, and may incidentally bestow bodily amendment, if He will.

Lazarus.—John xi. 43, 44, "He cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth" (ἐξῆλθεν), *i.e.* from the tomb. Compare xii. 1, 9, 17, "whom He *raised from the dead*" (ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν).

Dorcas.—Acts ix. 40, 41, "Peter put them all forth, and kneeled down and prayed; and turning to the body, he said, Tabitha, *arise* (ἀνάστηθι). And she opened her eyes. . . . And he gave her his hand, and *raised her up*" (ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν). Observe the verb in verse 40 used in the supernatural, and in verse 41 in the natural sense of "raising up."

Eutychus.—Acts xx. 9, 10, 12, "he fell down from the third story, and was taken up dead. And Paul went down, and fell on him, and embracing him said, Make ye no ado; for his life is in him. . . . They brought the lad alive, and were not a little comforted."

Compare Luke xvi. 31, "if one go to them from the dead . . . neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead" (ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ). Heb. xi. 35, "women received their dead *by a resurrection*" (ἐξ ἀναστάσεως).

E 5. The Evangelists record eight separate occasions on which our Lord foretold His Resurrection:—

After S. Peter's confession of the Messiahship.—Matt. xvi. 21, "From that time began Jesus to show unto His disciples, how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be *raised up*" (ἐγερθῆναι); Mark viii. 31, ". . . and after three days *rise again*" (ἀναστῆναι); Luke ix. 22, ". . . and the third day *be raised up*" (ἐγερθῆναι).

After the Transfiguration.—Matt. xvii. 9, "Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man *be risen from the dead*" (ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ); Mark ix. 9, 10, "He charged that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of man *should have risen from the dead* (ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ). And they kept the saying, questioning among themselves what *the rising again from the dead* (ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι) should mean."

On the journey through Galilee.—Mark ix. 31, "He taught His disciples and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill Him; and when He is killed, after three days He *shall rise again*" (ἀναστήσεται).

On the last journey up to Jerusalem.—Matt. xx. 19, ". . . the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and scribes; and they shall condemn Him to death, and shall deliver Him unto the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify: and

the third day He *shall be raised up*" (ἐγερθήσεται); Mark x. 34, and Luke xviii. 33, in almost identical terms, except that they have ἀναστήσεται.

On the Eve of the Passion.—Matt. xxvi. 32, "But *after I am raised up* (μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με), I will go before you into Galilee." Mark xiv. 28, in identical terms, except that he has ἀλλὰ instead of δὲ for "but."

The Chief Priests and Pharisees testify that they had heard Him foretell His Resurrection.—Matt. xxvii. 62, 63, "the chief priests and the Pharisees were gathered together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while He was yet alive, After three days *I will rise again*" (ἐγείρομαι), probably referring to the occasion recorded in John ii. 19–22.

S. John has two independent references of our Lord to His coming Resurrection.—The saying, John ii. 19, 20, 22, "Destroy this temple, and in three days *I will raise it up*" (ἐγερῶ αὐτὸν), misunderstood by the bystanders and brought up against Him at His trial, and cast up to Him when on the Cross, Mark xiv. 58, xv. 29. Even the disciples did not understand at the time that He was speaking of the temple of His Body, but John ii. 22, "when He *was raised from the dead* (ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν) His disciples remembered that He spake this."

John x. 17, 18, "Therefore doth the Father love Me, because I lay down My life, that *I may take it again*. No one taketh it away from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power *to take it again*." Compare John xi. 25, "I am the Resurrection (ἡ ἀνάστασις) and the Life."

E 6. *Passages in which the Lord's Resurrection is expressly mentioned after it* had taken place, omitting all circumstantial references, such as His appearances to His disciples, where the word "Resurrection" is not used.[1]

Matt. xxvii. 53, "Many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after *His Resurrection* (μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ) . . ."

Matt. xxviii. 6, 7, "He is not here; for He *is risen* (ἠγέρθη), even as He said . . . Go quickly and tell His disciples He *is risen from the dead* (ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν), and lo, He goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see Him." Mark xvi. 6–9, an account of the same incident with some verbal differences.

[1] Such, *e.g.*, as Luke xxiv. 36–43, ". . . behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself . . ." Acts i. 3, "the Apostles whom He had chosen: to whom He also *showed Himself alive* after His Passion by many proofs"; and the direct accounts of the Ascension.

[Mark xvi. 9, "Now when *He was risen* early (*ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωΐ*) on the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene."

Mark xvi. 14, "because they believed not them which had seen Him *after He was risen*" (*ἐγηγερμένον*).]

Luke xxiv. 6, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but *is risen*" (*ἠγέρθη*).

Luke xxiv. 46, "He said unto them that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day" (*ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν*).

John xxi. 14, "This is now the third time that Jesus was manifested to the disciples, *after that He was risen from the dead*" (*ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν*).

Acts i. 22, "of these must one become *a witness of His Resurrection*" (*μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ*).

Acts ii. 31, 32, "he foreseeing this spake of the Resurrection (*περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως*) of the Christ, that neither was He left in Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption. This Jesus did *GOD raise up* (*ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός*), whereof we all are witnesses."

Acts iii. 15, "the Prince of life, Whom *GOD raised from the dead*" (*ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν*).

Acts iii. 26, ". . . *GOD having raised up* (*ἀναστήσας*) His Servant, sent Him to bless you."

Acts iv. 2, ". . . being sore troubled because they taught the people, and proclaimed in Jesus the *Resurrection from the dead*" (*τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν*).[1]

Acts iv. 10, ". . . in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, Whom ye crucified, Whom *GOD raised from the dead* (*ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν*), even in Him doth this man stand here before you whole."

Acts iv. 33, "And with great power gave the Apostles their witness *of the Resurrection* (*τῆς ἀναστάσεως*) of the Lord Jesus."

Acts v. 30, "The GOD of our fathers *raised up* (*ἤγειρεν*) Jesus, Whom ye slew."

Acts x. 40, 41, "Him *GOD raised up* (*ἤγειρε*) the third day, and gave Him to be made manifest, not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with Him *after He rose from the dead*" (*μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*).

Acts xiii. 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, ". . . they took Him down from the tree and laid Him in a tomb. But GOD *raised Him from the dead* (*ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*): and He was seen for many days of them that came up with Him from Galilee to

[1] This may refer to the General Resurrection, but can also be="His Resurrection," that being the chief subject of Apostolic preaching.

Jerusalem, who are now His witnesses unto the people. And we bring you good tidings . . . how that GOD . . . *raised up* (ἀναστήσας) Jesus ; as also it is written in the second Psalm . . . And as concerning that *HE raised Him up* (ἀνέστησεν) from the Dead . . . He saith also in another Psalm, Thou wilt not give Thy Holy One to see corruption . . . He, Whom *GOD raised up* (ἤγειρεν), saw no corruption."

Acts xvii. 18, " . . . other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods : because he preached Jesus and *the Resurrection* " (*τὴν ἀνάστασιν*).

Acts xvii. 31, " He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge in righteousness by the Man whom HE hath ordained ; whereof HE hath given assurance unto all men, in that HE *hath raised Him from the dead* " (*ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*).

Acts xxvi. 23, " . . . saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come ; how that Christ must suffer, and how that He first *by the Resurrection of the dead* (ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρων) should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles."

Rom. i. 4, " declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, *by the Resurrection of the dead* " (ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν).

Rom. iv. 24, 25, " who believe *on HIM that raised* (ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα) Jesus our Lord from the dead, Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and *was raised* (ἠγέρθη) for our justification."

Rom. vi. 4, 5, " . . . that like as Christ *was raised* (ἠγέρθη) through the glory of the FATHER . . . we shall be also by the likeness of *His Resurrection* " (*τῆς ἀναστάσεως*).

Rom. vi. 9, " Christ *being raised* (ἐγερθείς) from the dead dieth no more. . . ."

Rom. vii. 4, " . . . joined to another, even to *Him Who was raised from the dead* (*τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι*) . . ."

Rom. viii. 11, " But if the Spirit of HIM *that raised up* (*τοῦ ἐγείραντος*) Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, HE *that raised up* (ὁ ἐγείρας) Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies. . . ."

Rom. viii. 34, " It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, *that was raised* (ἐγερθείς) from the dead, Who is at the right hand of God. . . ."

1 Cor. vi. 14, " and GOD *both raised* (ἤγειρε) the Lord, and *will raise up us* (ἐξεγερεῖ) through His power."

1 Cor. xv. 4, " . . . and that He was buried ; and that He

hath been raised (ἐγήγερται) on the third day according to the Scriptures. . . ."

1 Cor. xv. 12, "Now Christ is preached that *He hath been raised* (ἐγήγερται) from the dead. . . ."

1 Cor. xv. 14, 15, 17, ". . . if Christ *hath* not *been raised* (ἐγήγερται) then is our preaching vain . . . we witnessed of GOD that He *raised up* (ἤγειρε) Christ . . . if Christ *hath* not *been raised* (ἐγήγερται), your faith is vain . . ."

1 Cor. xv. 20, "But now hath Christ *been raised* (ἐγήγερται) from the dead."

2 Cor. iv. 14, "knowing that HE *that raised up* (ὁ ἐγείρας) the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also with Jesus . . ."

2 Cor. v. 15, ". . . no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him Who for their sakes died and *rose again*" (τῷ . . . ἐγερθέντι).

Gal. i. 1, ". . . through GOD THE FATHER, Who *raised Him* (διὰ . . . τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν) from the dead. . . ."

Eph. i. 20, ". . . HIS MIGHT which He wrought in Christ, *when HE raised Him* (ἐγείρας αὐτὸν) from the dead . . ."

Phil. iii. 10, ". . . that I may know Him, and the power *of His Resurrection*" (τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ).

Col. ii. 12, ". . . baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of GOD, *who raised* (τοῦ ἐγείραντος) *Him* from the dead."

1 Thess. i. 10, ". . . to serve a living and true GOD, and to wait for His Son from heaven, Whom HE *raised* (ἤγειρεν) from the dead . . ."

1 Thess. iv. 14, "For if we believe that Jesus died and *rose again* (ἀνέστη) . . ."

2 Tim. ii. 8, "Remember Jesus Christ, *risen* (ἐγηγερμένον) from the dead . . ."

E 7. *New Testament testimony to the General Resurrection in addition to the passages already cited, where this is conjoined with the declaration of our Lord's Resurrection.*—

Matt. xii. 41, 42, "The men of Nineveh *shall stand up* (ἀναστήσονται) in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it . . . The queen of the South *shall rise up* (ἐγερθήσεται) in the judgment with this generation . . ."

Luke xi. 31, 32, in practically identical words, except that he reverses the order.

Matt. xxii. 30, 31, "*For in the resurrection* (ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει) they neither marry, nor . . . But *as touching the resurrection* (περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως) of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the

God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

Mark xii. 25, 26, "*For when they shall rise* (ὅταν γὰρ ἀναστῶσι) from the dead . . . But as touching the dead, that *they are raised*" [1] (ἐγείρονται), etc.

Luke xx. 35, 36, 37, ". . . they that are accounted worthy to attain to that world, and *the resurrection* (τῆς ἀναστάσεως) from the dead . . . are sons of God, being sons of *the resurrection* (τῆς ἀναστάσεως). But that the dead *are raised*" (ἐγείρονται), etc.

John v. 28, 29, ". . . for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear His voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, *unto the resurrection of life* (εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς), and they that have done ill, *unto the resurrection of judgement*" (εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως).

John xi. 23, 24, "Thy brother *shall rise again* (ἀναστήσεται). Martha saith unto Him, I know that *he shall rise again in the resurrection* (ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει) at the last day . . ."

Acts xvii. 32, "Now when they heard of *the resurrection* (ἀνάστασιν) of the dead, some mocked . . ."

Acts xxiii. 6, "touching the hope and *resurrection* (περὶ . . . ἀναστάσεως) of the dead I am called in question." Compare xxiv. 21.

Acts xxiv. 15, ". . . having hope towards God, which these also themselves look for, that there shall be a resurrection (ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι) both of the just and of the unjust."

Acts xxvi. 8, "Why is it judged incredible with you, if GOD *doth raise the dead* (ὁ Θεὸς νεκροὺς ἐγείρει)?"

1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 15, 16, ". . . how say some among you that there is no *resurrection of the dead* (ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν)? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither *hath* Christ *been raised* . . . Whom HE *raised* not up, if so be that the dead *are* not *raised* (ἐγείρονται). For if the dead *are* not *raised*, neither *hath* Christ *been raised*."

1 Cor. xv. 21, "For since by man came death, by Man came also the *resurrection of the dead*."

1 Cor. xv. 29, 32, "If the dead *are* not *raised* (ἐγείρονται) at all, why are they then baptized for them? . . . If the dead *are* not *raised*, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

[1] Cf. Matt. xi. 3, Luke vii. 22, ". . . the dead are *raised* up" (*νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται*)," our Lord's reply to the Baptist's inquiries.

1 Cor. xv. 35, "But some one will say, How *are the dead raised*? and with what manner of body do they come?"

1 Cor. xv. 42, 43, 44, "So also is *the resurrection of the dead* (*ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν*). It is sown in corruption; it *is raised* (*ἐγείρεται*) in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it *is raised* in glory: it is sown in weakness; it *is raised* in power: it is sown a natural body; it *is raised* a spiritual body."

1 Cor. xv. 52, 53, "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead *shall be raised* (*ἐγερθήσονται*) incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on [1] incorruption."

2 Cor. i. 9, ". . . that we should not trust in ourselves, but in GOD *Which raiseth the dead*" (*τῷ Θεῷ τῷ ἐγείροντι τοὺς νεκρούς*).

1 Thess. iv. 16, 17, ". . . the trump of God; and the dead in Christ *shall rise* (*ἀναστήσονται*) first: then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air . . ."

2 Tim. ii. 18, ". . . men who concerning the truth have erred, saying that *the resurrection* (*ἀνάστασιν*) is past already . . ."

[1] Edwards (*First Ep. Cor.*, pp. 455–456) alone of modern commentators brings out clearly here the connection between this verse and 2 Cor. v. 1–5, where the same verb is used in verse 3 (and in verses 2 and 4 with *ἐπι* prefixed) and is there translated "clothe." This close connection between the great passages, dealing with the resurrection of the body, in the two Epistles to the Corinthians, should give those writers pause, who see a change in S. Paul's teaching in the second Epistle. In 1 Cor. xv. 52, 54, as in 2 Cor. v. 1–5, he is dealing not with the resurrection of those who should have died before the Lord's Coming—that he had done in the earlier part of the great chapter—but with what would happen to the bodies of those who should be alive at the Coming. In both Epistles he teaches with confidence that there shall be a complete transfiguration of the "quick." In the first, the change is thus described, "For this corruptible must put on (must clothe itself in) incorruption, and *this mortal must put on immortality*." In the second, "For verily in this (*i.e.* in this earthly tent-house) we groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed, we shall not be found naked (*i.e.* not bare, disembodied souls). For indeed we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that *what is mortal may be swallowed up of life*. Now He that wrought us for this very thing is GOD." The transformation of the bodies of the living is an act of God, as is the resurrection of the bodies of the dead (1 Cor. xv. 38).

The above was written before Bishop Chase published his invaluable little treatise *Belief and Creed*, in which a useful note on page 120 deals with the correspondences of language in 1 Cor. xv. 52–54 and 2 Cor. v. 1–5.

See also useful notes in Edwards (1 Cor. xv. 51) on various readings in the MSS. and versions of this verse.

Heb. vi. 2, " . . . not laying again a foundation of . . . *and of resurrection of the dead*" (*ἀναστάσεώς τε νεκρῶν*).

Heb. xi. 35, " . . . and others were tortured not accepting their deliverance, that they might obtain *a better resurrection* (*κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως*)," *i.e.* a resurrection better than the temporary return to ordinary human life, spoken of in the first half of the verse.

INDEX

Where several references are given, the most important are printed in heavy type.

ABELARD, 197
Abrahams, I., 57, 206, 275
Abyssinian Church, 110
Addai, 112
Adelbert, 189
Adon Olam, 275
Æschylus, 309
Alanus de Insulis, **201**, 204
Albertus Magnus, 202, 255
Albigenses, 58, **64–5**, 195, 199, **203–5**, 207, 209
Alcuin, 188, 190
Alexandrian School, 87–108
Allat, Prison of, 12
Allen, Dr. W. C., 288, 302
Ambrose, St., 134, 162, **163–6**, 212, 246, 247
Anabaptists, 219
Ancestor-worship, 3, 5
Ancoratus of Epiphanius, 155, 232
Angels, 106, 138, 168, 176, 264
Anselm, St., 171, **193–4**
Anthony II., Patriarch, 233, 234
Antichrist, 233
Antioch, 72, 73
Aphraates, 109–34
Apollonius, 100
Apostolic Constitutions, 155
Arallu, 12, 13, 21
Arians, 153, 219
Aristotle, 154, 205–8, 231
Armenia, 63
Artaxerxes, 30
Articles, Methodist, 222
  „ Thirty-nine, 225–8
Asceticism, 67, 112–16
Assyriologists, 15
Athanasian Creed, 219, 225, 290
Athanasius, St., 140–2
Athenagoras, 78–82, 139, 156
Augustine, St., 50, 54, 93, 96, 107, 135, 148, 154, 159, 162, 166–7, **169–77**, 178–80, 187–8, 192, 198, 205–8, 228, 246–7, 250, 259, 268, 272–3
Autolycus, 78

BABYLON, 11–16
Baptism, 44, 53, 114, 123, 129, 305
Barnabas, Epistle of, 71
Basil the Great, St., 142–3, 144–5, 158, 203, 230
Benson, A. H. Trevor, 274
  „ R. M., 258, 274
Bernard, Dr. J. H., 262
  „ St., 194–5, 196, 204
Bethlehem, Synod of, 241, 255
Bethune-Baker, Dr. J. F., 259, 294, 302
Bigg, Dr. C., 92, 293, 305
B'nai Q'yama, 115
Bogomili, 58, 63
Box, Dr. G. H., 28–30
Browne, Sir T., 306
Bruno, St., 192
Bucer, 214
Buddhism, 55, 264, 275
Bulgarians, 238
Bull, Bishop, 93
Bullinger, 214, 217
Bunyan, 75
Burial customs, 5–7, 13–14
Burkitt, Dr. F. C., 199, 114–16, 131, 286, 290
Burton, Prof. E. de Witt, 56, 275, 278, 286, 289, 296, 303
Byzantine Court, 144, 153

CÆSARIUS, 158–9
Calvin, 215
Carthage, 99
Cassian, 179, **180–1**
Catechisms :—
  Church of England, 243
  Council of Trent, 243
  Free Church, 223
  Maynooth, 252
  Orthodox Eastern Church, 242
  Pius X., 249, 252
  Westminster, 221
Cathari, 63, 219
Catholic Encyclopædia, 251
Celsus, 94–5

Cerularius, Michael, 233
Charles, Dr. R. H., 15, 20, 23, 31, 33–5, 54, 57
Chase, Bp. F. H., 319
Chrysologus, Peter, 179, 181–2
Chrysostom, St., 158, 238, 245
Church, Dean, 193
Cicero, 92, 108
Clarke, W. K. Lowther, 145
Clement of Alexandria, St., **89–91**, 206, 257
,, of Rome, St., 70–1
Codex Alexandrinus, 311
,, Marchalianus, 276, 281, 306
Communion of Saints, 5
Confessions :—
Augsburg, 214
Baptist, 221
Belgic, 216
French, 215
Helvetic, First, 214
,, Second, 217
Scottish, 216
Westminster, 219, 221
Confucianism, 5
Congregational Union, 221
Connolly, Dom R. H., 115, 129
Conybeare, F. C., 63, 100, 110
Cook, S. A., 28
Cosmas, 230
Councils :—
Chalcedon, 219
Constantinople, 67–8, 143, **153–5**, 157, 219, 240
Constantinople, Second Council, 67–8, 113, 153
Ephesus, 219
Florence, 240
Nicæa, 108, 113, 152, 161, 219
Trent, 243, 255
Cowley, Dr. A. E., 29
Creeds, 13, 51, 67, 69, 154, 235, 242, 258, 268, 310
of Aphraates, 116, 141
Apostles', 45, 214, 217, 221–2, 224, 259
Baptismal, 129, 154, 254, 273
Constantinopolitan, 155
of Damasus, 218
Jerusalem, 153, 155
Nicene, 51, 67, 153, 155, 222, 225, 234
Cremation, 11
Criticism, Higher, 15, 26–7
Cummings, Dr., 34
Cureton, W., 110
Cyprian, St., 100, 106
Cyril of Jerusalem, 142–3, **152–7**

Danby, H., 110, 134, 290
Denis, Prof. J., 91
Diognetus, Epistle to, 136
Docetism, 58, **59–62**, 73, 82, 85, 92, 272
Dominic, St., 205
Dositheus, 241
Downer, Dr. A. C., 131
Driver, Dr. S. R., 19
Duns Scotus, 202, 206, 212

Ebionites, 85
Edwards, Dr. T. C., 288, 319
Egypt, **6–12**, 17, 22, 25, 32
Ellicott, Bp., 128
Embalming, 7
Emmet, C. W., 299
England, Mediæval, 22
Epictetus, 56
Epiphanius, 234
Eridu, 11
Eucharist, 73, 83–4, 133, 199, 213–14, 254–5, 260, 301
Euripides, 309
Eusebius, 107
Eutychians, 219
Eutychius, 185–6
Eutychus, 313

Form of Concord, 219, 228
Frame, J. E., 128
Frazer, Sir J. G., 2, 10
Freese, J. H., 108
Friedländer, Dr. M., 4
Fulgentius, 171
Funeral Rites, 5, 16

Geneva, Evangelical Free Church of, 222
Gennadius of Marseilles, 109, 130, 177, 179, **182**
,, Patriarch of Constantinople, 230, **240**
George, Bishop of the Arabians, 126
Ghosts, 4, 5
Gibson, Bp. E. C. S., 155
Gifford, Dr. E. H., 298
Gnostics, 62, 67, 82, 84
Goodrick, A. T. S., 57, 275
Gottfried (Godefried), 171, 176, **195**
Goulburn, Dean, 159
Gregg, Dr. J. A. H., 30, 57
Gregory of Nazianzus, St., 142–3, 152, **157–60**, 202, 230
,, of Nyssa, St., 138, 142–3, **144–52**, 196, 202, 230, 267–8, 311
,, the Great, St., 178–9, **183–6**
,, of Tours, 184

Hades, 11, 19, 29, 264
Hall, H. R., 4, 7, 9
Harnack, Prof. A., 268
Hartland, E. S., 4
Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt, 192
Hell, 13, 19, 48
Heidelberg Catechism, 217
Heracleitus, 90–1
Hermas, 75
Herodotus, 71
Herveius, 159
Hilary of Poitiers, St., 135, **162–3**, 199, 274
Hildefonsus, St., 172, 187
Holmes, S., 57, 275
Holy Spirit :—
  body as shrine of, 38
  utterances of, 100
  and baptism, 124, 129, 130
  personality of, 128
Homer, 5, 309
Horace, 5
Hugh of St. Victor, 200
Hymenæus, 244

Ignatius, St., 61, **72–3**, 83–4, 255
  „ Patriarch of Constantinople, 234
Immortality of the soul, 5
Inge, Dean, 95, 106
Innocent III., Pope, 255
Inspiration, 18
Irenæus, St., 61, 70, 80, **82–6**, 257

Jacob of Nisibis, 109
Jeremias, Dr. A., 12, 14
Jerome, St., 93, 98, 101, 135, **162, 166–8**, 171, 181, 183, 187, 218, 246, 249
Jewish Prayer Book, 3, 275
John of Damascus, St., 140, 208, **230–3**, 246
  „ of Jerusalem, 168, 218
  „ VIII., Pope, 234
Julian the Apostate, 111, 142, 153
  „ of Arles, 179, 183
  „ Pomerius, 149
  „ of Toledo, 187
Justin Martyr, St., 61, **76–7**, 90, 156, 255

King, L. W., 4, 11
Knox, John, 216

Lactantius, 106–7, **108**, 135
Lake, Prof. Kirsopp, 70
Lanfranc, 192
Langdon, S., 12–15
Latham, H., 226
Leo, St., Bishop of Rome, 178, **179–80**, 181, 199, 228
  „ XIII., Pope, 243
Levi ben Gershom, Rabbi, 4
Lewis, Mrs. A. S., 290
Lightfoot, Bp., 61, 70–2, 128, 293–4, 299, 304
Lodge, Sir O., 258
Lombard, Peter, 63, **198**
Luther, 214
Lutherans, 214, 219

Macarius, 125
Maccabees, Books of, 31–3, 284, 310
Macedonians, 219
Macrina, St., 142–52
Magic, 4, 15
Maimonides, 205
Mangenot, Prof. E., 251
Manichæism, **62–7**, 113, 195, 203, 219
Marcionites, 219
Maspero, G., 12, 15
Maximus of Turin, St., 170, 182, 194
Melanchthon, 214
Memorial meals, 14
Merodach, 12, 14
Methodist Articles of Religion, 222
Methodius, St., **135–40**, 156, 237
Milligan, Dr. W., 229
Minucius Felix, 106–8, 135
Mogilas, Peter, 241
Monier-Williams, Sir M., 55
Monophysites, 219
Monothelites, 219
Montanism, 100
Moravians, 222
Moule, Bishop, 298, 300, 303–4
Muhammadanism, 203
Munro, Dr. R., 2
Mysteries, Christian, 256, 261, 271
Mysticism, 15

Nairne, Dr. A., 308
Naville, Prof. E., 7, 10
Neale, J. M., 231, 274
Nestorianism, 75, 219, 259
Nicholas I., Pope, 234
Nippur, 11
Noëtians, 219
Nonna, 157
Novatians, 219

Œcumenius, 230, **236–7**, 240
Oesterley, Dr. W. O. E., 30
Origen, 80, 89, **91–9**, 106, 115, 135–6, 182, 202, 205, 235, 237, 272
Osiris, 7–10
Otto of Vercellæ, 192

Pantheism, 264
Paraclete, 100
Paradise, 49, 131, 149, 220
Parentalia, 14
Parisot, Dom J., 110, 112, 126, 181
Pass, H. L., 112–13, 128
Patripassians, 219
Paul V., Pope, 243
Paulicians, 63, 65, 69
Paulinus, 171, 174
Pelagians, 219
Pelagius, 180
Peshitta, 122, 290
Peter of Blois, 201
Philetus, 244
Philo, 57, 92
Photius, 140, 230, **233–6**, 240
Pinches, T. G., 12, 14
Pius, Antoninus, 77
,, Bishop of Rome, 75
,, X., Pope, 249, 252–3
Plato, 53, 55, 58, 92, 107, 205–7, 267
Platonism, 106, 135, 275
Pliny, 71
Plotinus, 58, 92
Plummer, Dr. A., 226, 268, 289, 294–5, 297
Plutarch, 296
Polycarp, St., 61, 73–5, 107
Polycrates, 181
Polytheism, 18, 20, 32
Posidonius, 56
Priscillianists, 63
Prosper, St., 181, 192
Prudentius, 172
Pullan, Dr. L., 62, 100
Pullen, Robert, 200
Pyramids, 7, 8
Pythagoras, 107

Rabanus Maurus, 190
Rabbinic ideas, 120, 131, 311
Rashdall, Dean, 92, 211
Robertson, Bp. A., 295
,, Prof. A. T., 296
Robinson, Dr. C. H., 190
,, Dean J. A., 72, 300
Roman Church, 70, 73
,, ,, in England and America, 50

Sabellians, 219
Sadducees, 23, 132, 264
Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 290–2, 295–6, 298–9, 302
Sapor II., 111, 127
Satyrus, 164
Savoy Declaration, 221
Sayce, Prof. A. H., 9, 11
Schaff, Prof. P., 214, 228, 241
Schwenkfeldians, 228
Scott-Moncrieff, P. D., 7
Seneca, 56
Septuagint, 23, 71, 122, 275–9, 281–3, 287, 302–3, 306, 311
Simpson, D. C., 29
Socrates, 53, 90
Sophocles, 5, 309
Stoics, 90–1, 196, 275
Streeter, B. H., 228–9, 268
Strong, Bp., 180
Sumerians, 14
Swete, Dr. H. B., 75, 128, 131
Symmachus, 306

Taio, Bp. of Saragossa, 186
Talmud, 4, 119–21, 288
Tammuz, 12, 15, 25
Targumists, 114
Tatian, 77, 115
Taylor, Prof. A. E., 227
Tertullian, 98, **99–106**, 118, 171, 180, 256, 302
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 128
Theodoret, 159
Theodotion, 277, 281, 283, 306
Theophilus of Antioch, 78
Theophylact, 230, **237–40**
Thomas à Kempis, 274
,, Aquinas, St., 65, 202, **205–11**, 212, 227, 243, 260
Transmigration of souls, 101, 133
Turner, Prof. C. H., 194

Valens, 153
Valentinians, 84, 219
Valentinus, 113
Vergil, 5

Wace, Dean, 152
Waldenses, 64
Wellhausen, Prof. Julius, 27
Wells, H. G., 63
Wendt, Prof., 276
Wesley, John, 222
Westcott, Bp., 118, 229, 288, 290, 294–6, 302, 304
Westminster Catechism, 221, 252
,, Confession, 219–21
Wickham, Dean, 304
Wilhelm and Scannell, *Manual of Catholic Theology*, 250

Xenocrates, 92

Yellin, D., 206

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BECCLES.

69984 230.8S
Darragh J.T D252
AUTHOR
The Resurrection of the Flesh.
TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
Dec 16	Rhodes.	DEC 23 '75

236.8S
D252

69984